



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

AN SHIN S

DIVINE EFFICIENCY  
AND  
MORAL HARMONY

BJ  
1406  
.T5

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL  
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL  
LIBRARY



From the collection  
of the  
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL  
SOCIETY









THE  
DIVINE EFFICIENCY,  
AND  
MORAL HARMONY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSE;  
PROVED FROM  
REASON AND SCRIPTURE.

BY A PASTOR.  
*Obediah*  
O. H. Tillotson

"The Lord hath made all things for Himself; yea even the Wicked for the day of Evil."—PROVERBS, xvi: 4.

"Whereunto also they were appointed."—1 PETER, ii: 8.

---

BOSTON:  
JAMES M. USHER.  
1854.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1854, by  
**WILLIAM C. BARNES,**  
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

**SOUTHBRIDGE:**  
**GREENE AND BROWN, PRINTERS.**

BT  
1406  
.T5

## CONTENTS.

---

- CHAPTER I. — DEPENDENCE OF MORAL CHARACTER UPON NATURE.** — Whatever is developed in conduct was in creation. Man can create nothing. God is the Author of all Human Character. All expect others will act according to Nature. All conduct was certain from Eternity; and God alone made it certain. God is necessitated by His nature. Scriptures sustain this view, . . . . . 9—18
- CHAPTER II. — HUMAN OPINIONS ON THE SUBJECT.** — Baptist, Orthodox, and Arminian Authorities. Christian Review. Dr. Pond. Dr. Woods. Dr. Emmons. Professor Upham. Confession of Faith. Dr. Lyman Beecher. Dr. Ballou. John Wesley. Conformity of Events to Fore-knowledge, . . . . . 19—28
- CHAPTER III. — CONSCIOUSNESS.** — Man conscious that he cannot will differently. Motives control Volition and conduct. A Necessitating Tendency indispensable to action. Freedom not ability, Nothing been possible which has not existed. Specimen of the opposite side, Dr. Woods, Author of History of Enthusiasm, . . . . . 29—42
- CHAPTER IV. — THE LAW OF GOD.** — God did not design obedience in every case. Cases of Pharaoh, Sennacherib, and Ahab. The Law but *one* of many instruments. God could not design obedience when not rendered. Nature is full of counter Laws. The will of God not always indicated by Commands. Different senses of the term will. Character the highest Attribute of existence. The Law will accomplish its Author's design. Repentance consistent with Necessitarianism, . . . . . 43—59
- CHAPTER V. — SIN.** — Sin not something avoidable. Bible full on this point. God's Definition of Sin, . . 60—63

CHAPTER VI. — RETRIBUTION. — Retribution remedial. Greatest Happiness of all Moral Beings not antagonistic. Dr. Woods on Sin of Adam and Eve. Retribution illustrated by Pain of the Body. Analogy between the Moral and Physical World. Christian Review. Law condemns what is unavoidable. Dr. Pond's <i>NON SEQUITUR</i> . Importance of the subject, . . . . .	64—78
CHAPTER VII. — HUMAN KNOWLEDGE OF THE SUBJECT. — Dr. Ballou's objections. Pantheism <i>not</i> involved in necessity. Nature's Revoltings. "Conflict of Ages" noticed, . . . . .	79—93
CHAPTER VIII. — MORAL TENDENCY OF THE SYSTEM. — Has no Tendency to promote Sin. Compared with Orthodox System. Necessitarianism most conducive to Holiness. Arminian's Universe different from that of the Necessitarian. In <i>Heart</i> the Arminian adopts the Necessitarian Theory. The character of believers in Necessity vindicates the Doctrine from all scandal. Difference of Man and Heaven on the two Systems. Future Discipline. Influence on Hope. Notice of article on "Agencies in Salvation," . . . . .	94—118
CHAPTER IX. — DIFFICULTIES RELATING TO THE ORIGIN OF SIN. — The mistake relating to what Sin is. Sin a Divine Instrumentality. Man, or Angel can no more be the Author of Absolute Evil than God. Character is Essential in its Nature. Moral Disorder in Harmony with God. If Absolute Evil exists must be an Eternal evil. Punishment only one means of Repentance. Bible declares that God is the Author of Sin. Edwards. Hosea Ballou. A Fall impossible. Neander on the Fable and Parable, . . . . .	119—130
CHAPTER X. — IMPORT OF EDWARDS' SYSTEM, AND THE ESTIMATION IN WHICH IT IS HELD. — Professor Tappan's Effort. Baptists and Orthodox adopt Edwards. Baptist view of Election, . . . . .	131—136
CHAPTER XI. — OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED. — Dr. Sawyer's Article. Dr. Pond's view. Necessitarianism only ground of certain salvation. Sin a less evil. How our opponents must prove their theory, if at all, . . . . .	137—153
CHAPTER XII. — SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY, . . . . .	154—156

## P R E F A C E .

---

ABLE Works have been written upon the Human Will ; but we know of no Author who has attempted to illustrate and defend the system here presented, for the purpose of applying it to the support of the most gratifying of all doctrines, namely : That in no possible manner, nor to the least degree, can sentient Creation fail, either to promote, or to enjoy, all the Good that the Creator benevolently designed. Too important to be overlooked, and too plain to not be perceived, this theme is destined to ere long shake terribly the already tottering systems of error ; as a recent work, entitled, "THE CONFLICT OF AGES," fully testifies. With pleasure we behold the deepening and widening interest of late manifesting itself.

All must greatly wonder at the amazing stupidity, or moral obliquity, which could believe in a real Human Inability to obey the Divine Law of love, and at the same time assent to the prevailing theory of Guilt and Eternal punishment. If Causes in every instance control character, and if all moral actions have been fore-knownn from Eternity, then obviously, all Moral Causes and Effects, whether relating to God, to angels, or men, must have been, and ever continue to be, absolutely Necessi-

tated and unavoidable. Nor can the mad-dog cry of "Infidelity," raised by error against every innovation by Truth, longer suppress investigation and free-speech.

An Orthodox professor once charged a candidate for the ministry, to imitate the student of Nature, who "put every thing into the fire, and observed what came out." Our Orthodox brethren ought not to censure any one for following this advice. The cause demands the utmost fidelity, in imitation of illustrious examples by Prophets, Apostles, and Jesus Christ. None admire the conduct of one under the pressure of Conscience, first writing a body of Divinity, and then suppressing honest convictions, lest utterance should subject him to suffer for the Truth. Such faith is without works; such a man cannot sublimely say, "I believed, therefore have I spoken." All rather admire him in a holy cause, girding on Divine Truth and Charity, who burns his boat, and thus cuts off the possibility of retreat after invading error's domain; seeking either victory or death! He may be denounced; but such treatment in such a cause is a crown of glory!

Were we to admit that there is a class who take no especial interest in this great question, such a fact could not reflect credit, but contrariwise; since it is easy to perceive, that the tendency would be to the suppression of all development of the Human Mind. As the greatest discoverers have frequently been of humble origin, all classes should be encouraged to freely think, and freely speak. Christianity knows no high, no low, no great, no small, all being one in Christ; and Providence often choosing the foolish to confound the wise, and things that are not, to bring to naught the things that are; that no flesh may glory in His sight.

If it be the duty of the Ambassador of Christ, to apply remedies where disease is the most rife—as is the rule for him

who administers to Physical Health — it must be obvious, that the greatest necessity points directly to the condition of the Church in respect to the subject presented in this work.

The haste in which the work has been written and committed to the press, to meet the seeming necessity of the times, must serve as an apology for any apparent defects in style, or otherwise ; the Author having aimed at little more than to be understood.

With the concluding remark, that the writer wishes no one but himself to be held responsible for the doctrines contained in the subsequent pages, they are submitted to the candid examination and judicious criticisms of a discriminating Christian Public ; and especially dedicated to THE FRIENDS OF FREE INQUIRY THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.



# DIVINE EFFICIENCY, AND UNIVERSAL HARMONY.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### DEPENDENCE OF MORAL CHARACTER UPON NATURE.

CHRISTIANITY teaches that God created all things out of nothing. Man is only what God made him to be, and the same is true of all other beings. If Man has borrowed or adopted anything not originally in him as an embryo, that thing must have been made by the Creator, and its adoption by Man proceeded from his nature. To have anything 'exist which God did not make, we must suppose, either that some creature made it, or that it was self-existent and hence Eternal, or that it sprung from nothing; but neither of these suppositions can be true. To avoid the conclusion that all things came from God, we may be told, "That Sin is not an Element, but a Disposition or Exercise, and that God is not the Author of all exercises and dispositions; although He is the Creator of accountable Beings, to whom they belong."

Moral actions must be considered the Necessary fruits or Effects of the Nature divinely given to creatures. If character be the development of the nature received from God, then the Author of man's Nature must be considered the Author of Character. Should it be said that some dispositions or actions are not the fruit of Nature, and this assertion be true; such dispositions or actions as are not the fruit of Nature must have sprung from nothing, or been Eternal. Man could no more avoid acting than existing. Whatever exists is a Cause, and all causes necessarily involve corresponding Effects, according to circumstances, in the precise manner in which they result. The Nature which God gave Man involved the character which has resulted from it, as much as the existence of a tree comprises the fruit it bears; voluntariness being only the mode of moral development. If it be said that, "Nature has been perverted," unless by perversion is meant, that one portion of Being has been qualified, modified, or affected by other portions, which we know to be true, and which was obviously designed by the Creator who made all, so that such effects would result; what is called perversion, must be an Effect which has sprung from nothing; and hence is not supposable. Man has not acted differently, only because there was nothing existing under the circumstances, to produce a different result; and a different character could no more have existed, than something could have proceeded from nothing.

All men obviously expect that mankind will in-

variably act in accordance with their natures, — a good man acting right, and a bad man acting wrong; and when they are disappointed, relating to human conduct, they never suppose that the person disappointing them has acted contrary to his nature, but conclude that they mistook relating to what Nature was; not again trusting one whom they regarded as virtuous, whose conduct has proved him to be vicious. A bad man will not act right until he is changed; nor will a virtuous person act wrong until he has been corrupted or overborne by an amount of temptation greater than his moral capacity of resistance; all moral Nature in man having a limit which may be exceeded by contrary influences, and being liable to become modified by, either the circumstances in which it is placed, or the influences bearing upon it. Christ teaches that Character necessarily depends upon Nature, declaring, "A good tree *cannot* bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit."

Obvious and irrefragable as the above proof is, there is still another independent testimony to the same effect: When the Creator made Nature, including Man, all that will ever have resulted was Certain, and was fore-seen, as what would exist without failure. To deny this, is to deny the Divine attribute of Omniscience. If all human character was certain to exist, before Man was created, some Cause must have made it certain; and as the Certainty of human character existed before Man had being, who can believe that Man was the Au-

thor of a certainty that existed before himself? In the mind of God all existed as a certainty — or rather the knowledge of all — before any creature was made; and hence both the Knowledge and the Existence of all depended on God, who alone existed to make them certain. Jehovah purposed to create a Universe, and that all, including Man, should result precisely as He fore-saw it would; in time and in eternity. The Nature he gave to Creation and the circumstances or relations He ordained, infallibly secured the existence of whatever God desired and of whatever will result, — all depending on Himself, and being contained in embryo, in the laws and tendencies of whatever was made. To deny that Jehovah designed to produce *all* that he fore-saw would result from Creation, involves the absurdity, that he put forth the plastic hand to Create, with the knowledge in his mind that, at least in some respects, He would fail to accomplish his design; which was to produce a certain definite result, *and nothing besides*. If any Being, having perfect knowledge that certain consequences will result from it if it be made, make an instrument; the very making of that instrument proves, that all fore-seen consequences were designed and purposed thereby, in the mind of its maker. Must not he who thus makes an instrument, be regarded as the Author of all fore-seen results? And is not this applicable to the case before us?

As showing how unqualifiedly dependent on God all creatures are, we need to state only that,

were it possible for any being to act contrary to the nature given him, and to what God fore-saw he would act,—besides involving that that being had dispositions and conduct having no corresponding Cause in Nature, such a possibility must involve also, that the Eternal attribute of Divine Prescience can be proved to be false, and that God may know that an event will take place, which may never occur. It is sometimes said, that man might act contrary to what his Maker Eternally fore-saw he would, and that had any creature so acted, the Divine Fore-knowledge would have corresponded with the act, by fore-seeing it different. The error of such a view arises from an idea, that the Divine unalterable Fore-knowledge does not exist *previous* to the conduct to which it relates. Instead of this, let the inquirer after Truth settle the point in his mind, that the Divine Fore-knowledge has been a fixed, unalterable fact, from Eternity; and then let him ask himself *how* he can reconcile that fact with a possibility, that the Eternally fore-seen action or character may be otherwise than in correspondence with the previously existing Divine knowledge and absolute certainty relating to it? As Fore-knowledge of an event and the event Fore-known, in every case must have a *corresponding* existence, to say that a fore-known event may not occur, is as plain a contradiction as to say that a thing exists, and at the same time does not exist.

As manifesting the correctness of the absolute Principle upon which we base the conclusion that God is the Author of whatever results from Creation,

and that wherever it exists, whether created or uncreated, Nature controls all Results, we may further observe, that the Creator Himself is represented in Scripture as subject to this principle. Upon what other ground is it declared that God cannot lie; that He cannot be tempted with Evil; that He cannot deny Himself; unless it be the impossibility of His acting contrary to the Divine nature; or in any manner or to the least degree inconsistent with it? If the Divine Nature so far controls the Divine actions, that *God* cannot do anything contrary to his Moral Attributes, as is declared by Inspiration, can it be reasonably supposed that Man has a freedom which does not belong to God? Man and Angels have a moral nature as well as God, and that nature as much controls their conduct as their Maker's nature controls the Divine conduct.

Having thus far followed the clearest Principle known to man; a principle never known to have a single exception, and which constitutes the Law of the Material as well as the Spiritual Universe, namely: that Effects must ever correspond\* to the Causes which produce them, it is now proper to advance a step: It might be reasonably supposed that the word of God is not silent on such a subject, and we now appeal to the Divine testimony. We shall here find nothing equivocal,—it will not be difficult to understand which side of this

\* By the correspondence of an Effect to its Cause, is meant that it is similar in its *kind*; and that it never exceeds it, in its *degree*.

great question is sustained by the inspired writers. By Isaiah Jehovah declared, "My Counsel shall stand and I will do all my Pleasure." God is ever the same. If His counsel shall stand and He will do all His pleasure at one time or in one instance, the same is true of Him at all times, and relating to all events. We are sometimes asked, "Is the Will of the Lord done at all times?" Our answer is, That it is, and that it can never be otherwise; and this is only saying the same, in substance, which Jehovah Himself affirmed by the declaration, That He would do all His Pleasure. If God's word was true, and if He have done all His pleasure, as He said He would, the assertion, that all His pleasure is done, is true also. But are not the Divine commands broken, daily and hourly? They are; but this is another matter, to be discussed in its place. The most superficial mind must have seen ere this, that there is occasion for making a broad distinction between the Law, or commandment of God, and his Will or purpose. To go no farther upon this point at present, let any one consider the word of God by the apostle Paul, to the Romans: Of Man as a race, he says, "For the Creature was made subject to Vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in Hope." Man was subjected to Vanity—made a sinner—by his Creator; and at the same time at which Jehovah subjected his accountable Creature to Sin, He made him subject to another law, commanding him not to sin. Should it be said, This is a contradiction; still the two facts—

the existence of God's law against sin, and the subjection of man to sin — remain, not more contradictory than other Scripture facts, namely: that at the very time at which God required Man to love his neighbor as himself, He "sent him," "gave him a charge," and made him His "indignation," to impiously "tread" his fellow man as "mire in the streets;"\* and also that, at the same time at which He required Pharaoh to let His people go, He hardened his heart that he should not let them go.

One of the most remarkable illustrations of the Divine Government in the Earth is furnished by the prophet Micaiah, relating to the death of wicked king Ahab, whom His Maker determined to destroy in battle, by using Man as His instrument. After the prophet had been threatened for his fidelity, to his princely persecutor he said, "Hear thou therefore the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on His throne, and all the host of heaven standing by Him, on His right hand and on His left. And the Lord said, who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth Gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit and stood before the Lord and said, 'I will persuade him.' And the Lord said unto him, 'Wherewith?' And he said, 'I will go forth, and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets.' And He, [God] said, 'Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also; go forth and do so.'"

\* See Isaiah, x: 5-20.

Such are only part of the more prominent cases mentioned, while the inspired Volume elsewhere declares, that *all* human conduct, and all terrestrial events, are included in the same Government, and controlled by the same Laws; showing that God's hand is in all, that not even a sparrow falls without our Father, and that the Creator worketh all things, as Paul declares, after the Counsel of His own will; according to Isaiah, doing all His pleasure. If the Judge of all the Earth could control the conduct of Pharaoh, of Sennacherib, and Ahab, in perfect harmony with moral Agency and accountability, as is here shown; then is the entire Divine control, on account of which all men are called upon to rejoice and be glad, equally consistent. In every instance, the character and reward of the agents are according to the motives they adopt; selfishness ever rendering its possessor miserable, and benevolence being as unvaryingly productive of happiness.

Beautiful is the light shed upon this subject by the Divine Prophecies. With what striking particularity and minuteness of detail, as well as grandeur of outline, do the ancient Scriptures foretell human conduct, transacted hundreds of years afterwards! That individual must be strangely depraved or deluded, or both, who can boldly deny that Prophecy reveals in the clearest manner, the doctrine of the Universal Divine Efficiency relating to all human actions. The least possibility of divergence from a fixed line by any one generation or person, operating obliquely through ages, could not fail to so far vitiate the result, as to render prophecy false, and

thereby impeach the word of God. If there be really the kind of Divine Government for which the Arminian contends — if such a plan may be properly called a Government — it is truly wonderful, and no less fortunate, that not one of all God's moral Creation has ever acted contrary to, either His Fore-knowledge or prophecies! It will always be thus; which could not be affirmed as certain, on any other hypothesis than that of the Universal Divine Efficiency above described. Is it rational to believe that such an exact coincidence between every action of the whole Human family, and the Fore-knowledge of God, which embraces all Events including the particulars foretold, could have resulted from year to year and from age to age, except on the plan of the Universal Divine control, which includes all actions and character? All must agree, that such a coincidence between the Divine Fore-knowledge, including Prophecy, and Human Conduct has existed; since, if it have not existed, it follows, that at least some of God's knowledge has been already proved false, besides much more that may yet be so proved; thus quite destroying all reasonable confidence in the Divine Counsel.

## CHAPTER II.

## HUMAN OPINIONS ON THE SUBJECT.

ON a theme so important, it is interesting to inquire, what are the views entertained by the Christian World? The Baptist denomination believe in the doctrine of Moral Necessity, as follows :

“ The conceptions of the intellect, the desires of the heart, and all other motives being the same, a different Volition, could not, merely from want of disposition in the Agent, have been put forth.”\* “ Why does the mind put forth one Volition rather than another? Philosophy has no right to waive this inquiry. The solution of it is a natural demand of the Human Intellect which must be satisfied.”† “ The doctrine of Edwards is, that the influence of Motive in securing Volition, is just as uniform and certain in its results, as the action of any Cause in producing its Effects.”‡

After describing a certain character, this Reviewer says :

“ Let such an one be applied to for aid, . . . the extension of relief would be the Necessary, and the only possible Result, from these supposed cir-

\* Christian Review, 1843, p. 241.

† Ibid. p. 243-4.

‡ Ibid. p. 377.

"cumstances." "Moral Causes may be Causes in  
"as proper a sense as any causes whatever."\*

The following language of McIntosh, this Reviewer approbates: "It is impossible for Reason  
"to consider occurrences, otherwise than bound to-  
"gether by the Connection of Cause and Effect;  
"and in these circumstances consists the strength  
"of the Necessitarian Scheme."† Relating to Mo-  
tives, he says:

"It may be infallibly predicted which must pre-  
vail, owing to the known previous tendency of  
"such motives upon such a mind."

Such are the uncontradicted statements of the  
highest authority of the Baptist denomination,  
which is Calvinistic, and agrees with the Orthodox;  
whose sentiments relating to Human Agency we  
now propose to show: Dr. Emmons, one of the  
most prominent and esteemed deceased ministers  
of the order, says:

"Should any object in the Material World, or  
"any Creature in the Intellectual World, act or  
"move in a manner different from that which God  
"originally intended, it would mar His glory and  
"injure the Universe, which He is under indispen-  
"sible moral obligation to prevent."‡ "It is abso-  
lutely certain that God did not elect any to Eter-  
"nal Life from a fore-sight of their good works.  
"The truth is, God elected them to Holiness in  
"this life, that they might be Eternally happy in  
"the next."§

\* Christian Review, 1843, p. 281.

† Ibid. p. 383.

‡ Works, vol. 4, p. 383.

§ Ibid, vol. 6, p. 316-17.

His opinion of the method by which the lost are fitted for Eternal punishment, we learn from his remarks upon the case of Pharaoh:

"Pharaoh was a Reprobate. God determined from Eternity to make him finally miserable. This determination He eventually carried into effect. He brought him into being, formed him a rational and accountable creature, tried him with mercies and judgments, hardened his heart under both, caused him to fill up the measure of his iniquity, and finally cut him off by an act of His Justice."\* "They [all men] cannot originate a single thought, affection, or volition, independently of a Divine influence upon their minds. They are always under a Moral Necessity of acting just as they do act. The way of Man is not in himself. It is not in Man that walketh to direct his steps."†

Dr. Woods of Andover, says:

"When our First Parents apostatized, what did they do but follow those propensities of theirs, which were excited and rendered powerful by temptation, their pious disposition being unstained by Divine influence. . . . And what Beings, possessed of the same Natural and Moral Attributes, and placed in the same circumstances, would not have acted in the same manner? I hold it to be a truth too plain and certain to admit of proof, that Causes perfectly alike, acting upon subjects perfectly alike, will produce like Results."‡

\* Works, vol. 4, p. 330.

† Ibid. vol. 4, p. 397.

‡ Lit. & Theo. Review, 1834, p. 178,

Dr. Pond, President of Bangor Orthodox Theological Seminary, in a review of Edwards on the Will, says:

“He certainly held that our Volitions, like every thing else which comes into existence, must have an adequate Efficient Cause. And where could he have placed this Efficiency but in God? To have placed it in Man, or in the will of man, would have been to set up again that self-originating, self-determining power which he had demolished. To have placed it in Motives, would have been absurd; since motives, in the sense of Edwards, are but the general instrumental causes of volition — the reasons why they are put forth, and not the Efficiency that produces them. Where, then, we ask again, could Edwards have rested this Efficiency, but in the great First Cause of All? The younger Edwards says expressly, ‘that the Deity is the Primary Efficient Cause of all things, and that He *produces Volitions* in the Human Mind, by such second causes as motives,’ &c. Again; ‘He who establishes the Laws of Nature, so called, is the Primary Cause of All Things. He is the *Efficient Cause of Volition*, by a general law establishing a Connection between Motives and Volitions.’ . . . He [Edwards] held it to be a settled law of the Will, that its exercises must be put forth in view of motives, and are always as the strongest motive, or as the greatest apparent good. But who established this Law of the will? And who sustains the various powers of the mind, and continues their

“regular operations, and connects volition and motive in this particular way? Undoubtedly, He who gave existence to the Human Mind; He whose power created, and whose hand sustains and governs all things. . . . Without doubt the Will of the Deity is subject to the Great Law of Motives, equally with our wills; and that, in respect to Himself, this Law was established, not by His own Pleasure, but by the same mysterious Necessity from which he exists. All possible motives are before Him, and were so from Eternity; and it is a Law of His Moral Nature, for which there is the same reason as for His existence, that His Will shall always be in accordance with those motives which are intrinsically wisest and best. And to be subject to such a law is no disparagement to the Divine Being, but rather His glory. Without it, He could not be entitled as He now is, to unlimited confidence. Without it, in short, He would not be God.” “Without doubt God could have conceived of a Plan, and might have adopted it, which should have excluded Sin. But in excluding sin, it must have excluded Redemption from sin, and all the surpassing, overbalancing blessings which flow to the Universe in consequence of redemption; so that such a plan must have been not better than that which is going into operation, but greatly inferior to it.”\*

Professor Upham says:

“It is in this simple proposition of the Will’s sub-

\* Lit. & Theo. Review, 1834, pp. 534-35, 538, 437-8.

“jection to Law, that we find the golden link, which binds us to the throne of God. If my Will is not subject to Law, then God is not my master. And what is more, He is not only not so in fact, but it is impossible that He should be so.”

“ART. VIII. *Of Free Will.* The condition of Man, after the Fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength, and works of faith, and calling upon God. Wherefore we have no power to do Good Works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that Good Will.” “The Scriptures teach us to consider *Election and Reprobation, according to the Fore-knowledge of God, from the foundation of the World.*”\*

Quotations might easily be extended to the amount of a large volume, and from equally distinguished Authors. These are presented to show the reader who may not have been familiar with the authors quoted, the views which have long been held by men, first in mental power and distinction. Comment upon them is unnecessary; since, whatever questionable points they possess, they represent God as the only Efficient Cause of All Things, including human Volitions and Character. Take only the last quotation from Wesley, which is received by all Arminian Methodists: “*Election and Reprobation are from the foundation of the World.*”

\* M. E. Discipline, by John Wesley, 1808, pp. 8, 64.

It follows, that each Human Being was then unalterably Elected or Reprobated, according as his character was fore-seen. Since the Destiny or end to which the conduct and experience of life and Eternity were certain to conform, was fixed from Eternity, will it be candidly affirmed that any Human Being could have acted otherwise than in conformity thereto? If any one could, then may a Creature derange the Eternal Purposes and Counsels of God!

Of two things which must conform to each other, that which first exists, becomes a rule for the remaining thing, to which, in compliance with the supposed Law of agreement, it must conform. If the decree relating to Human Destiny existed before Man's conduct or character, and if character and destiny must correspond, then the Decree of Destiny must have become an imperative measure, or Rule of character, from which man may not, and cannot depart. We neither say, nor mean, that in such case, the bare Certainty had any influence in producing human character. Certainly character had no influence in producing the Divine Determination what the Eternal destiny should be; because the determination had the priority in order of time. But we do say, that the same Law or Cause, foreign to both, controlled both, and made them conform to each other; and that Cause was the Great First Cause.

We have dwelt upon Mr. Wesley's statement, for the purpose of showing that the *Arminian* view involves that the Deity is the Cause of all Human

Conduct, by His Eternal Purpose, relating to all human destiny. Whoever carefully examines Mr. Wesley's VIIIth Article, cannot fail to see that the same conclusions necessarily grow out of its several propositions, which clearly maintain the doctrine of Moral Necessity. Other quotations from Methodist Works might be given, to the effect that God controls Human Conduct. In the Life of Mrs. Hester Ann Rogers, the sentiment is expressed, that pious persons are immortal, till their work is done.

The Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church, both Old School and New, has the following :

• “Man, by his fall into a state of Sin, hath wholly “lost all Ability of Will to any Spiritual Good accompanying salvation.”\* “When God converts a sinner and translates him into a state of grace, he freeth him from his natural bondage under Sin, and by his grace alone enables him freely to will and to do that which is spiritually good.”†

Of the above, Dr. Lyman Beecher says :

“I believe in the Moral Inability which it here declares.”‡ “I agree therefore with Turretin, “that Man, laboring under such an Inability, is “falsely said, to be able, if he wishes,” — implying “that a sinner’s wishes may change a heart fully “set on evil.”§

A writer in the *New York Independent*, of No-

\* Chap. ix, on Free Will.

‡ Views in Theology, p. 124.

† Sec. 4, chap. 9.

§ Ibid. p. 119.

vember 3d, 1853, an Orthodox paper, who signs himself, "*A Descendant of the Pilgrims*," says:

"But - that which seems to have been adopted most generally by New England Divines, seems to be, that we have from Adam or otherwise, a native disposition, propensity, inclination, bias or taste, which though it is not of itself sin, or sinful, Causes us to choose the evil and refuse the good; and is indeed the true Cause of Sin. . . . It is a Principle of Ethics that every cause must have its appropriate Effect."

Some may tell us that:

"To use the nomenclature of foreign Metaphysicians, the subject is inextricably involved in the question concerning the passage from Psychology to Ontology; and that it is a question we never can lay open, while we remain finite creatures."\*

Admitting that we can never fully explain the philosophy of the subject, any more than Attraction and Repulsion in Matter, must we, on that account, put an extinguisher on human intellect, and breathlessly caution and forbid all men against drawing conclusions, as plain as that two and two are four! Scripture and Reason teach, that the Deity Eternally Fore-knew all that will ever have transpired in Time and Eternity. Reason as clearly teaches that, once having settled the unlimited knowledge that all Events and Character would transpire in a certain manner, no Event can any more differ from that Knowledge, than

\* See Article in Univer. Quarterly, vol. iii., by Dr. Ballou.

knowledge can be false ; which all men know to be impossible. Again, Reason teaches that God is the Author of all existence except His own ; and that nothing can proceed from existence which is not first created in it, according to the circumstances it is placed in ; and the inevitable conclusion, as plain as any thing, is that, whatever results from Creation was in it, and was put into it by the Creator ; with both the knowledge that it would, and the intent that it should proceed from it. Or must we ignore the whole, and deny the very Laws which are legibly stamped upon our Minds by the Deity ; because there is something in every thing which we do not know ? We may go further : Since the Bible teaches that Jehovah "worketh All Things," it must follow, that no Creature can avoid his actions ; nothing being plainer, than that the sentiment, that any Creature can act differently, is in direct contradiction to the proposition, That the Great First Cause works all Human Conduct. If, as the Dr. says, this is "a question we can never lay open, while we remain Finite Creatures," since we shall never become any other than "finite," Eternity will throw no light upon the question ! Such a mode of reasoning would drive all Human Knowledge from the mind, whether possessed here or hereafter, or relating to this world or the next !

## CHAPTER III.

## CONSCIOUSNESS.

WHILE they love life, are any persons conscious, that they can will to thrust a knife into their vitals, or to drink a phial of prussic acid? As must be the case, if all are conscious that they *cannot* so will, they ought to be convinced, that Motives control their Will, and that it is morally impossible to resist them; what is most prized always governing conduct. Will it be said that the Control may be avoided, by determining whether the motives shall influence the will, or not? If the Government of Motive depends on a previous choice, relating to the question of destroying one's own life, the mind can determine that the motive deterring it from doing so, shall not control it. But do not all feel that it is impossible, while they love life, to determine, that the motive to preserve it, shall not control conduct? *Love* controls men; and that control cannot be avoided. The inquiry whether a motive shall control us in any case, is only the same case presented to the mind in a different form; in the above supposed case, the only question being, whether or not one would kill himself. Though he could not sacrifice his life to such an object, a man might reject a trifling offer, for the purpose of showing that he could act freely; but

who can fail to see, that even his attempt to show that he could, either reject or accept a trifling consideration, proves the Control of Motive; since, had he not most prized the delusive appearance of a possibility to either side, he could not have rejected the trifling offer, for the purpose of showing that he could reject it. But do we not determine which of two, or more objects, shall be most attractive to us? This question is answered, by deciding whether, in like circumstances, a penny or a gold eagle, is most desired. If one man offer a hundred dollars, and another only five, for the same work, must the mind first determine that an hundred shall have more influence on the Will than five, before it will have more influence? In the nature of the case, a hundred have more influence; and the question, whether one will be influenced by it, is only another form of the simple question, whether he will choose an hundred dollars, or five. The influence of Motive inheres in the object presented, as that object relates to desire, love, or propensities; and belongs not to Man's Will. We are conscious that our Will, or Volition, can never make the influence of one dollar, equal to that of a thousand, considering the money alone; although some other commodity thrown into the scale with the dollar, may add sufficient influence to more than counterbalance the thousand dollars;—as for instance, a lady, for a companion, whom one loves, with a dowry of only a dollar, instead of one who is displeasing, with a dowry of a thousand dollars.

If Consciousness universally teach, that the great motive, the preservation of happy life, Morally Necessitates us to avoid taking a deadly poison, it teaches us also, that the Law of Motives involves Necessity of Control, according to the amount of the motive; a small motive having as much power to control action, according to its measure, or weight, as the largest, and when no motive exists on the other side to neutralize its influence, as certainly Necessitating action; just as a bit of bread will as certainly influence a hungry man as a loaf, if it be all that he can get; or as a small shot will move the scale. Small motives are as real, and as certainly contain the Principle governing the Will, as do larger ones; as a drop of water has weight, and density, according to its amount, no less than the ocean, which is composed of drops. Thus are we Conscious, that our Will is always governed by Motives.

To most minds familiar with Mental Philosophy and the topics which enter into the subject before us, it is believed that the doctrine, that all human beings act from Necessity, and cannot act differently, is as palpable as a self-evident proposition. It makes no difference whether a man be an advocate of the theory of a Self-Determining Power of the Will, or of any other theory; since it would seem that all must admit that, without a tendency to action in the Moral Agent, he cannot act at all; any more than an Effect can begin to exist without a Cause. If the mind, or will, be the cause of its own action, to be such a cause, it must have a ten-

dency to action, without which it could cause nothing. But when, as we must, we have established such a tendency to action, located somewhere, we have also established a Necessity of action, according to that tendency. It makes no difference in the result, though there be admitted to exist different, opposite tendencies; since, if the tendencies in favor of duty are precisely equal to those against it, each class of tendencies in that case perfectly counterbalances the other, and together, leave the mind balanced, as if it had no disposition either way. If we suppose, as we must to have any action whatever, that the tendency one way is stronger than that in the opposite direction, then the mind necessarily moves with the stronger tendency, as certainly as if there were no tendency except in that direction. To attempt to get back of this plain view, for the purpose of evading the force of the argument; to affirm that the Moral Agent determines whether he will have a tendency or not, and in which way the tendency shall be, is to suppose, either that the mind, upon this preliminary question, acts without any tendency, which is absurd; or to suppose that it decides whether it will go according to its tendency, by the control of a tendency; which in substance is the ground we assume, and involves Necessity. As to have any action whatever, there must be a Necessitating Tendency to action; so also no being in the universe can even so much as endeavor to change the tendency of his own mind; because there is no Cause in him to produce such an Ef-

fect;—because nothing can act in opposition to itself;—because whatever acts at all, must act agreeably to itself; or must act itself, and cannot act beyond, out of, or anything beside itself. God cannot change Himself. Every being, or thing, operates with the whole force of nature to prevent a change, by any foreign cause; and this is removing all existence the whole extent of Being, from any possibility of attempt at a self-caused change.

A careful consideration of the import of the term "Freedom," will guide us to the same general conclusion: Is Freedom a negative, or a positive quality? Had this question been asked and fairly answered in every case of discussion upon this subject, a vast amount of confusion and trouble, not to say nonsense, might have been avoided. The advocates of Arminianism have uniformly proceeded, as if Freedom of a Moral Agent were a *positive* quality, when the very reverse is the case; as a moment's reflection will satisfy any one. It is said that water is free, when no obstruction is in its way; that Man is free, when nothing out of himself hinders him from acting as he wills; thus always correctly associating with the term, only a negative quality; unless when men are in controversy, and press the word beyond its correct import. A man is free to do what there is no possibility of his doing; such as flying to the moon, making a world, or plucking the sun from his orbit. He is free to do these things, since there is no positive impediment in

the way to prevent him; but no mere freedom, implies a Possibility to do them or anything else; an Action, or Volition, being a positive thing, and requiring a positive ability, which is more than a mere negative ability; such as Freedom. The reader is free to write such an Epic as the Iliad, or the Paradise Lost. Does this freedom of his involve a Possibility of his doing it? We think not. A freedom to will, does not involve a possibility to will; because something more than Freedom, namely: an inclination and motive, are necessary to will. President Day speaks of "a *liberty* to either side," and thinks there is no such thing; but we are sure that there is liberty to either side, when no motive exists either way; which only means that there is nothing to prevent Volition and Action either way; mere Liberty being the same as Freedom, and never implying Ability. But he used the term liberty in the same sense as "power;" which to avoid confusion, it ought not to be used to express, and certainly does not imply. Moral Freedom implies, not only that there be no Physical obstacle in the way of volition, as Dr. Woods defines it; but also that there be nothing Moral in the way of willing; which does not however imply a possibility; because both willing and acting require *Ability*, as well as liberty. Let no one who would be correct, say that an act is possible by a Moral Agent, simply because that agent is at Liberty or Free to do it; Freedom implying no part of an Ability.

The Possibility of a Moral Action depends, not

only on Freedom of the Will, but much more upon positive attributes and conditions, each of which is indispensable to its existence; such as a stronger motive for, than against it, mental and corporeal ability, with a prevailing desire to do it. To state the whole truth, the *doing* of a moral action alone proves that it is possible. Nothing has ever yet been possible in the Universe, which has not existed; nothing will ever be possible which will not exist, for want of an adequate Cause under the circumstances to produce it. Whenever an Adequate Cause exists, the *corresponding* Effect is certain to exist also; whenever no adequate Cause exists, unless something can begin to exist without a cause, an Effect is impossible. It is naturally impossible for God to create any Being, and not totally control it; since creation, or existence, implies nature, and Nature necessitates conduct, whether control be Divinely designed or not; although it is impossible to not be designed by the Creator.

The reader may be satisfied that we have reasoned correctly from the principle, that Effect must ever have a Cause, and be in correspondence with it; but rather than admit our conclusions, he may reject the principle itself. To this course, for the sake of the argument, we have no objection; and will now furnish him a fair specimen of the opposite side. If anything can begin to exist without a cause, God may not be self-existent, or eternal, and the universe may have sprung from nothing having no Creator. Is the reader prepared to admit

this? If effects are not necessitated to Correspond to their causes, an oak may proceed from a pebble as soon as from an acorn; an ostrich from a stone, as soon as from an egg; from the egg of a humming bird, as soon as from that of an ostrich; an ox may be hatched from the egg of a sparrow; a horse from that of the robbin, or grow from a potatoe, a kernel of corn, or a cabbage seed; frost may warm us, and fire freeze; we may see with our ears and hear with our eyes; when we will to move the foot, it may affect only the hand; God may act as much worse than a devil as he is greater; and so on, the most fertile imagination filling up the grotesque picture,

“Where all life dies, death lives, and nature breeds  
“Perverse, all monstrous, all prodigious things,  
“Abominable, unutterable, and worse  
“Than fable yet hath feigned, or fear conceived!”

To us, it seems as plain as any self-evident proposition, that the moment it is proved, that sin or anything else, can possibly result from a cause which is not in essential and circumstantial correspondence therewith, the absurdities described, and a thousand times more, may be true also. That men may possibly confuse thoughts, either in their own, or other's minds, we do not doubt; but that any one will ever meet, and fairly overthrow the argument, by which all possible, or existing results are traced back directly to God, as flowing from Necessity, we do not believe. The theory we oppose is based in ignorance, — a darkness which

may be felt, fleeing away so soon as men sufficiently awake to see things as they are, and seeking a temporary, and probably last refuge, in the transcendentalism of Hume and Berkeley.

We are not aware that any one excepting Mr. Hume and his school, ever denied the maxim, "*Whatever begins to exist, proceeds from some cause.*" If this maxim, in which all Christians believe, be true, sin must have had a cause. Whether it be something in man, or in some other moral being, the immediate cause of sin, if it had beginning, must have had a cause also, and so onward, including all the links in the chain of Causes and Effects which are only secondary, or instrumental, up to the *primum mobile*, or Uncaused; who is thus seen to have become the cause of whatever exists.

To proceed one step farther: Cannot an effect be prevented, although its Cause exists, by an intervention between Cause and Effect? Alas! Contingency has no help at this last point of its gasping extremity! nothing having yet been found in the Universe, to prevent any existing Effect, and prevention cannot spring into existence from nothing, any more than anything else.

When the advocate of Free-Will as it is generally understood, employs materials to rear his edifice, the least scrutiny convinces the beholder, that every truth he uses, instead of corresponding with his theory, points in the opposite direction, and shrinks backwards, appalled at such a desecration. When the senses of the unfortunate man are once loosed from the dungeôn of Error and Prejudice which

have enthralled them, he will see every ray of light in the Universe, like the artist's pencil, glaringly inscribing upon his work, the awful word — BABEL !

After having shown that Moral Nature denominated Affections, necessitates Conduct, in vindication of the Reasonableness and Benevolence of the Appointment of this law by the Creator, Dr. Woods says :

“ Would you regard it as a privilege to will and  
 “ to do what is contrary to every affection and dis-  
 “ position of your heart? Would it gratify you to  
 “ be so constituted that, while all your Affections  
 “ move towards God, and delightfully rest in Him,  
 “ your *Will* might put forth choices in opposition to  
 “ Him, and so lead you to open disobedience? Such  
 “ might be the result, if your will should break loose  
 “ from the control of the Affections, and put forth its  
 “ acts in any other way. What distraction would  
 “ be so dreadful as this! To reduce Man to such  
 “ a condition, his rational and moral constitution  
 “ must have a tremendous and unheard of shock.  
 “ Happily for us, our intellectual and spiritual Con-  
 “ stitution is secured against such a calamity as  
 “ this, by the appointment, and ever-present Agency  
 “ of the Being who made us.”

The following equally pertinent testimony, is from the pen of the talented and accomplished Author of the History of Enthusiasm :

“ For a moment, let it be inquired, what advantage a sentient and intelligent being could derive  
 “ from an absolute emancipation from Causation,  
 “ or from the certain sequency of Effects? The very

"notion of a real Contingency, in this sense, is in-  
 "admissible in philosophy. But let it be granted  
 "as a thing conceivable. Ought not, then, this  
 "Freedom from Causation, to be termed rather a  
 "Necessity, of the most dire and formidable sort?  
 "And he whose prerogative it should be would  
 "become an object of as much pity as the wretch  
 "who lives in the grasp and keeping of a mad-man.  
 "This power or prerogative of Contingency, by the  
 "hypothesis, obeys no Motive; adheres to no Con-  
 "nection of truth with truth; is not to be calculated  
 "upon, nor fore-known, is not governed by relation-  
 "ship to any actual existence, or abstract principle.  
 "But it is manifest, that, to an intelligent being,  
 "whose welfare is committed to himself, and who  
 "provides for that welfare by calculating upon the  
 "known order of Nature, the liability to Contin-  
 "gency, whether in the internal or external system,  
 "must be a pure curse, by deranging every pro-  
 "vision and thwarting every purpose. A liability to  
 "sudden phrenzy, would not be at all more fearful,  
 "than the liability to sudden Contingency. The un-  
 "happy being, so privileged to live beyond the cir-  
 "cle of Nature, and so distinguished as an outlaw  
 "from the orderly System of Causation, would be  
 "justified in making for himself such an apology  
 "as this: 'Whenever, and as long as my conduct  
 "is governed by Reasons and Motives, I cheerfully  
 "consent to be treated as a responsible Agent;\*' and

\* This author probably had not traced out the system,  
 which he thus defends with a master's hand, to its full bearing  
 on the question of retribution, as shown in these pages.

“ am willing to receive the due consequences of  
“ my actions. But not so in those dark moments,  
“ when the fit of Contingency, (my fatal glory,)  
“ comes upon me:—then, and in those porten-  
“ tious moments, I am no longer master of my  
“ course; but am hurried hither and thither by a  
“ power in the last degree capricious, whose freak-  
“ ish movements, neither Men, nor Angels, nor the  
“ Omniscient Himself, can fore-see. Fain would I  
“ surrender the fatal Freedom, and take my place  
“ among those who enjoy the benefits of the Laws  
“ of Nature and Reason; but it is the unalienable  
“ condition of my existence, to be governed by a  
“ power more stern and inexorable than fate itself.  
“ Alas! Contingency is mistress of my destinies.’”

Much has been said about the Creator's Overruling Events, Sin, etc.; but God tells us that, “*All things work together for Good.*” Sin must be included in “all things,” and since “all work together,” there cannot be such a universal and great antagonism and opposition, between Sin and the object of all other things, as some have supposed. By the term, “overruling,” which has been applied to God, seems to be meant, the diversion of Sin from its Natural Tendency; in a manner different from what relates to other things. Such a distinction, however, is unscriptural; the term not being found in the Bible, neither the idea it conveys; but instead, it is said, that God does this or that Work; or that Instrumental Causes do it, as in the passage quoted.

As held by all who style themselves Evangeli-

cal, if Man cannot live from birth to death without sin, and if as is self-evident, no one can be the primary efficient Cause of whatever he cannot avoid, if also, God is not its Cause, what being is? To make Satan such a cause, would be to primarily and efficiently subject Man to Satan,—quite too monstrous an idea to be admitted. To avoid the difficulty, if it be said that any one *can* live through his temporal life without sin, it follows that such an one can be received into heaven without a Vicarious Atonement, having never been lost. Those who deny our theory, and hold the Orthodox view of Atonement, so far as we can perceive, must find themselves in a dilemma here.

Unitarians, as well as those self-styled Evangelical, fully recognize the Necessity Man is under to Sin; which, to many minds would seem the most exceptionable, as well as the main Principle of our System. Dr. Burnap, one of their first Authorities, says:

“The condition of man, then, on earth, as in a “state of moral probation, amounts to this: God “has given him two chances for happiness;—one “through sinless obedience; the other, through repentance and reformation,—in short, through “*moral discipline*. Human imperfection renders “the first [sinless perfection,] impossible, and therefore God has kindly provided the second.”

Is it proper to call that a “chance for happiness,” which is “impossible?” The fact, that sinless perfection is impossible, once admitted, consistency compels the admission also, that all sin is equally

unavoidable. Does God, or superior evil spirits, render "sinless perfection impossible?" One or the other must. We regret that Unitarians are not always consistent with the above view, and hope they will yet become so.

Can Man defeat the Will of his Maker? Have demons rejoiced in the not mistaken idea, that they have inflicted absolute and Eternal injury upon the Divine Creation, and thus magnificently gratified their revenge? How does the Infinite One appear, in the light of such doctrines as prevail relating to this subject? Must all holy beings, not excepting Nature's Great Architect, Eternally carry about with them, as a mourning badge, the conviction that the Universe is not what it would have been, had Man not sinned, and God not been defeated in His Benevolent Purposes? Upon what compensating scale will our opponents show a making up of the exact loss, or repay God for the extra trouble Sin has caused, by which it will appear that Evil will not have ultimately, to some degree, triumphed in diminishing the amount of Good otherwise ultimately existing? If indeed, as Dr. Pond contends, Sin has introduced a more glorious Plan, and if God did not Purpose Sin, then obviously, the sinner has *improved* upon Jehovah's Plan, and might well have been made God's Councillor! The theory we oppose seems childish, if indeed it do not go far towards making God a child.

## CHAPTER IV.

## THE LAW OF GOD.

WHAT is the Divine Law, as seen in the light of the entire dependence of its subjects? Would the Creator make a Law requiring his creatures to act differently from what He had purposed they should? Considering the Divine Law as a rule of Moral Perfection in creatures, and an expression of rectitude in the Moral Governor, as well as an instrument to secure a purpose to be *fully* executed at a future time, the early revelation of which would immediately serve important ends, we see no difficulty in admitting what we know to have been the revealed fact relating to Pharaoh, namely: that his Maker did manifest, by hardening his heart, that it was the Divine Will that he should disobey the Great Moral Law of Love. The same truth is seen in every instance in which the Scriptures teach that the Divine Being used an Agency in leading his creatures to disobey him; such as relating to Sennacherib, and King Ahab. There stand the facts, 1st. That God had commanded them in a certain manner, by the Universal Moral Law, and, 2dly. That He used means to produce disobedience. No mere denial can affect the truth in the case.

The Law of God must be unalterable. It must also be promulgated to all Moral Beings. It had a definite end in view, which embraced immediate, remote, and various points of interest. Viewing these several features of the case, it is not surprising that there is a *seeming* discrepancy, between what it enjoins, and what the Divine Mind Purposed. Owing to human imperfection, probably it was impossible for God to have a law, the letter of which should not be in apparent contradiction to its design. Which is best, — to say that owing to Human imperfection, God's Law was revealed in such a manner that the letter appeared to imperfect creatures contradictory to the Divine Intent, or to say, as we otherwise must, that God's Will is not done, when He declares that it is? One or the other of these propositions we must affirm; because, either the Divine Will is not always done, or it is not the Divine Will that Moral Beings should obey the Law of Love in any case in which they disobey.

This Law is but one of many instruments, for the accomplishment of Jehovah's Purposes, which, as we shall see, it is certain to do; and all the discrepancy there is between its letter and its design, is incidental to the delay attending a progressive measure, to instantly accomplish all that that measure expresses, it not being possible in the nature of the case, for the Law to express anything besides the final purpose of its promulgation, which is the moral condition enjoined by its terms. Designing that Man should experience an advance.

ment and progression before arriving at the condition indicated by the Law of Love, also seeing it best to reveal at once, and in unalterable terms, a rule which should serve to éleveate creatures to a state of union and fellowship with their Maker, the apparent discrepancy between the letter of the Law, and the immediate, or earliest executed design of it, seemed unavoidable.

God gave Man the Law of love before He intended that he should obey it, to reveal the doctrine of Moral Rectitude, that in its light, and long before he would make it effectual in raising him to its standard, the creature might see and feel his own moral disorder, and that it might serve as an element entering into the great moral conflict and discipline which will go on from age to age, without its either making, or being designed to make, any one of its Human subjects, before Death, fully conformed to it, if, indeed, even to the end of time, any man will ever live in the flesh, perfectly obedient, or be morally capable of thus living. It would probably not be far wrong to say, that God never intended that any man in this world, none having entered the raised state, should perfectly obey it; perfect holiness, or obedience, being inconsistent with imperfect human organization, and the circumstances man is in, without the sustaining Divine Power enjoyed by Christ; only the dead being freed from sin, and the flesh lusting against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and these being contrary one to the other, so that we cannot do the things that we would in other circumstances,

and with different organizations. And yet, the revelation of this Law, all the while, answering important Divine Purposes, modifying human experience, and powerfully and widely operating to work out the Divine problem to be yet fully solved by human existence. Who shall assure us that this Law was not revealed for the sole purpose of effecting precisely all the good that it will have accomplished, and at the precise time of its accomplishment, without its Author ever designing to effect thereby any more than this; especially since Jesus Christ declared that, not "one jot or tittle should pass from the Law, till all be fulfilled." It is immaterial to our purpose what law Christ alluded to in these words, since, if one Law of God cannot fail in a jot or tittle embraced in its purpose, then all the Divine Laws must equally succeed in fulfilling their design. Who will assure us that the Law of Love could have done this, had its terms not been what they now are, or that, though God would not render it effectual to perfect holiness in Man in this life, and never designed that it should at present affect creatures any farther than it does; nevertheless, since it is a perfect rule of rectitude, expressing at the same time what a perfect God would require, and what all perfect creatures would render; since also, He would thereby impress imperfect Man with the idea of the moral order, and harmony of heaven, and thus draw him towards the state of just men made perfect, who can declare, in such a case, that it was not perfectly proper to reveal, and enjoin it to the human family as it is?

Let those who deny this theory, at least present a more reasonable view of the subject, before they request us to renounce ours.

If Jehovah purposed that any Divine Law should be obeyed in any case in which the creature disobeys it, He must have used means without any prospect of succeeding in His Purpose; which, for want of motive, has generally been supposed to be impossible; the Divine Fore-knowledge excluding any prospect of whatever result will never have occurred. The following Scriptures show that it has not been the Divine Purpose that Man should always obey the law he was amenable to. To the Jews Christ said, "Fill ye up the measure of your wickedness." To the same people Paul said, "Well spake the Holy Ghost—saying, go unto this people and say, Hearing ye shall hear and not understand; and seeing ye shall see and not perceive, for the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and should be converted, and I should heal them." "And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned, who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." Did God design that men should obey His Law of Love, at the very moment at which, as above expressed, He used means for the purpose of preventing obedience? He must have done this, or it has not been His will that Man

should obey the commandment, for the transgression of which he has been punished.

Is the prevention of the Law of Love by another law, and the Divine intent that it shall not at all times universally prevail, any greater inconsistency in Deity, than the same facts regarding His other laws? whether they relate to Matter or Mind. There is often as much discrepancy between the necessary result of a Physical Law, and what that law indicates to the human mind as being the end of its appointment, as we have stated to be true of the Divine Law of Love. Thus when a small plant springs up, the Law of Vegetation recorded upon its foliage, indicates that it is the Will of God that that plant shall come to maturity. But, long ere this occurs, a storm, or lightning, or the fall of a tree, which was equally appointed by the Great Architect, has overborne the former law, and killed the tender herb; the event proving the Will of God to have been different from what was indicated by the vegetable alone. The Divine Will is written on *all* the Laws of the Universe, Physical and Moral, taken together, and to understand it, we must read all, and fully comprehend them. Looking upon any one alone, or any *part* together, we mistake the import of the lesson; although the Great Moral Law of Love is ever held up to the mind, to stimulate the moral appetite for holiness, and eventually perfect rectitude, at the well appointed time.

Like many other aspects of Truth, the doctrine of the Divine Universal Efficiency requires us to

discriminate between the different senses in which the term "*Will*" is often used in Scripture. At one time this word imports what the Divine Law of Love requires; as in the passage, "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine;" thus expressing the tendency to enlargement in Divine Knowledge, involved in conformity to the Law of Love, or holiness: Again, "Whosoever doeth the Will of my Father, the same is my mother, my sister, and brother," in allusion to the moral affinity existing between Christ and the obedient. But when the Apostle speaks of God as a "Being who *Will* have all men to be saved," a Divine *Volition*, and not a rule of moral rectitude for man, is alluded to. That the Divine Volition or Purpose, and the rule or Command given to Man, are not the same in substance, is as plainly taught in the Bible, as God commanded Pharaoh to let the people go, and then hardened his heart, with the intent that he should not let them go, as that he commanded David to not number the people, and then moved him to do it. In how puerile a manner have some attempted to get rid of the hated doctrine, that God has an Agency in producing disobedience to His Law, by saying that He hardened Pharaoh's heart *negatively*, by withdrawing His Spirit; as if the mere manner of His doing it, made any difference, or, as if doing it negatively, even if that were the mode, did not as fully manifest the Divine Will in the event, as if He had done it positively; as if I should not as truly overturn my neighbor's wall or house, by removing the foundation, as by push-

ing it over. How long will men cheat themselves out of the truth, at so very cheap a rate!

Whether possessed by the Creator, or His creatures, Moral Character is a grade of existence far above brutes, and superior to any mere Natural Attributes; and hence its creation is a work equally superior to the production of any other qualities of either matter or mind, of brutes or Moral Beings. That Man does not originate his moral character is taught by the Apostle, who declared to his brethren, "It is God who worketh in you, both to *will* and to do;" "*created* in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God before ordained, that we should walk in them — being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who *worketh all things* after the Counsel of His own Will;" "Of Him, through Him, and to Him, are *all things*," which must include all Sinful Volitions. If Man is the creator of sinful character, then he must be the creator of his own Holiness also, and all human holiness and salvation must depend on Man, both here and hereafter. Who will affirm that this is true? which must be true, if Man is the creator of his own character. The moral glories of heaven belonging to creation, will infinitely exceed all that will be merely natural. On the hypothesis that holy beings are the creators of their own Moral attributes or character, the glory produced by creatures will a thousand times farther transcend what God will have created, than the picture of the greatest master exceeds the coarse canvass it is painted upon, or the easel made by the rough carpenter! Moral

character is not a mere form or mode, but an Essence; the most elevated and important of all essences, constituting the glory of God, and the felicity of Moral Beings. How erroneous must that system be, which involves that the acme of Being; the highest culminating point of creation, is attributable to Man; thus making an insignificant creature put his Maker quite into the shade, comparing work with work! The only way to avoid a consequence so revolting, is to deny that any Moral Beings are the authors of character; which leaves the case as we state it, making God and not man its Author. To say that Man is the author of sinful character, but not of holiness, involves that to save Man, the Laws of Moral Agency, in every case of regeneration, are contravened or reversed, from what they were before the Creature was converted; and then the inquiry would press itself, to what purpose was a moral agency given, which must be thus violated to save its possessor; and again, if the Creator can consistently thus violate the Laws of Moral Agency, and in that manner save Man, why could He not as well, have absolutely controlled Agency in the first instance, and throughout, and never have given an agency in any case, requiring such a violation. We have often wondered why those who recognize the Absolute Divine Control relating to Eternal Life, should deny that control, relating to the least action or interest; since it is difficult to reconcile the two diverse laws operating at the same moment in one person, and if Freedom from the Laws of Causation exists in a

small matter, why not relating to that of greatest magnitude; and *vice versa*?

If our language is understood, we have as well succeeded perhaps, in explaining this point, as can be done relating to many positions, the reception and belief of which involve far less difficulty than their rejection. What we next propose, which is plainly revealed, must fortify the above view.

The Law of God will fully accomplish the end that its Author designed. In the Law as we use the term, may be included many moral means, such as the Light of Nature; the Gospel; the Divine entreaty and expostulation; and that Code written on tables of stone, the ultimate effect and design of which are to elevate Moral Beings, rendering them holy. One passage will be sufficient to show that the object of the Law of God will be accomplished: It is found in Isaiah 54, as follows, "For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither,—so shall my word be, that goeth forth out of my mouth. It shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereunto I sent it."

The New Testament contains numerous testimonies that the law of God is certain to accomplish its purpose, in the final holiness of all its subjects. Jesus Christ declared of Himself, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." "God was in Christ, *reconciling* the world unto Himself." And as above quoted, Christ declared, that not a jot or tittle shall fail from the law, till all be fulfilled.

The Creator has purposed what Man shall be at any moment and at all times to the remote periods of his existence, and secured the accomplishment of His purpose by instituting means, additional to the Creation, which together, according to their inherent virtue or principles, will render His creatures what He would have them. The Apostle Paul spoke of a law in his members, warring against the Law of his Mind; thus showing that, while Nature is a Law of God no less than the Law of Love, sometimes one Divine Law prevents another; the event accomplished at all times agreeing with the Divine Will.

It will hardly be denied that the Creator has different laws, some tending in one direction, and others in a different direction. Of two apparently opposing laws, such as the Law of Sin which Paul said was in his members, and the Law of Love, when either prevails the other is not used in the case by the Universal Operator; although His Will is equally done whether one law prevail or the other,—one being the Divine instrument sometimes, and sometimes the other.\* Thus Holiness may be said to be a transgression of the Law of God no less than sin is, meaning *the* Law in the members, of which God must be the Author. If there be found in the Bible a single instance in

\* See Judges 9 : 23 ; and 2 Samuel 24 : 1. Forms of speech, such as, "God is the Author of Sin," are unimportant; but the *truth* asserted in the Scripture referred to, namely : that God *produced*, or *caused* treacherous dealing which is sinful, by *sending* an evil spirit, is by no means unimportant.

which God is clearly represented as exercising an influence and purpose to lead Man to disobey the Law of Love,—and we think this article furnishes numerous cases of the kind, or if God be the Author of all things not excepting Volition in Man by the Law of Motives, it follows that the Creator has moral laws suited to the different purposes of leading His creatures into sin, or into holiness,—the term “Moral” being applicable to whatever relates to motives, or volition. Unreconciliation and rebellion have a Moral Harmony with God, as instruments chosen by Him for the accomplishment of His Holy Purposes; and so also of all other forms and attributes of sin.

One of the greatest seeming difficulties involved in the doctrine of the Universal Divine Efficiency, arises from the apparent contradiction between such a theory and repentance. How can one consistently, be sorry after a godly sort for what was best, and willed by the Creator? The inconsistency if any consists in the change from sin to holiness, by the prevention of one Divine Law and the execution of another; and involves no more contradiction than any simple reversion. To have actual contradiction and absurdity, we must have something equal, or analogous to the assertion that, at the same moment, and relating to the same action, the law of sin and the law of love are in the ascendant; but nothing similar to this exists in the case before us. The essential difference between Sin and Holiness by no means proves that wherever either exists, it does not equally subserve the Divine Pur-

poses, as much as both the erection of scaffolding, and their subsequent removal, may alike, at different periods, and without any real contradiction, promote both the final and the mediate purposes of a house-builder. The real difference between Sin and Repentance, being produced by the different Laws of Love and Sin including their fruits, is embraced in the "all things" which Paul said worked "together for good." Accordingly, though David was Divinely moved by the Law of Sin to number the people, no sooner was the counter moral Law of Love applied, than we see his remorse, godly sorrow and penitence; and so of many other Scripture examples. But is not first sinning as is best, and then repenting of it as is best, an inconsistency, or contradiction? No more so than all fruits of opposing Laws which prevail in the Divine Economy; and not at all inconsistent relating to the final effect or purpose of all Laws and their results, namely: the production of the best whole; which is the great bond of Universal and Eternal Harmony, taught by both Nature and Revelation.

At the time at which Sin is committed, it is best that the disordered moral palate should roll it as a sweet morsel. But the time comes when it is best, and the Divine Will, that it should begin to disgust or sicken the soul, by the Law of Love imparting a degree of moral health; and hence sorrow for the sin exists. A little more health, and repentance succeeds. Godly sorrow is not for the fact, that the sin committed was best. On the contrary, if

the individual is conscious that his carelessness or selfishness has not produced absolute injury, but good, in entire consistency with his sorrow he rejoices that such has been the result, instead of evil. But as he did not aim at such a result, and although he may be conscious that, for wise reasons, his Maker gave him that oblique aim, the imparted health makes him revolt at sight of his former disorder, to which Moral Order is repugnant, and by which it is put away. The sin repented of did not conduce to present moral health, although it did tend to other immensely greater good; while the sorrow for it relates principally, though not exclusively, to moral rectitude; to be secured when it will be consistent with other interests.

When Joseph's brethren sold him into Egypt, they acted by the Law of Sin in the flesh, but that law resulted in the precise measure God had purposed, — the going down by the lad into Egypt, as was best. And when those wicked men were humbled, and repented; when a fraternal spirit took possession of them, they considered their former treatment of their injured and amiable brother, and judged and felt relative to it, agreeably to the promptings of their new hearts of flesh; their minds fixing particularly upon the, in themselves considered, odious features of their former character, and not upon the fact that, on the whole, their conduct was best, including all its springs. That the Sin was best; that they nevertheless were heartily sorry for it, with remorse and penitence, notwithstanding all the good they saw resulting from it, are

certain; and hence the conclusion that there is no real inconsistency, contradiction, or absurdity in repentance for what was best, is certain also. This simple narrative meets every possible objection to our hypothesis. The reader is requested to consult the case of David, numbering the people, as related both in Chronicles, and 2 Samuel, in which it is stated that both satan, and God moved the King to sin; and the same hypothesis will appear fully proved.

The view that sin is wrong involved in repentance, is taken from the stand-point of the Law of Love, of which sin is a transgression, and of the temporary and partial, or relative evil it produces; and not from the stand-point of its Universal or absolute effects, as best, on account of which it was willed by the Creator. He who will affirm that such views, from *different* stand-points, must be absurd and contradictory, simply because they differ from each other, and *would* be antagonistic if taken or produced at the same point, can scarce reason upon any subject. The view of sin as best, on which account it was Divinely Caused, is *true* as relating to its Universal bearings, or effects. On the other hand, the view of sin as odious and hateful, to be repented of and forgiven, is *true* also, as relating to the Moral Law of Love which is sin's antipode, and also in the light of its temporary and relative evil fruits. Every cause which produces temporary and partial evil, as well as much greater good, must be viewed in the light of both these results; and hence, as is the case with sin, it must be

*approved* in one light, and *condemned* in another ; the greater effects, or the balance in favor of happiness or misery, stamping the thing, as a whole, either as good, or evil. Few things if any exist around us which do not, at present, minister to both pain and pleasure ; while all causes and effects are good, as having a vast and inconceivable preponderance of good over evil, and as being a necessary means to promote the greatest possible good. We think this view perfectly reconciles the Divine Causation and utility of sin, with repentance for it after a Godly sort, obviating all objections.

As the law of moral rectitude requires him to do, the pious parent endeavors to restrain his son from sin ; but failing in this his joy is not at an end, if at all abated ; because he realizes that that Being who appointed Man to this imperfect estate, and, for sufficient reasons, subjected him to Vanity, designed all its items and phases, as much as the Maker of the ocean included all its drops ; or the Creator of the Earth its every particle, not excepting external storms and internal fires ; its mountain avalanches, palpitating earthquakes, and flaming volcanoes. Relating to the relative, temporal evil, he has sorrow ; but relating to the final and general result, he knows that for the Human Race and the whole Intelligent Creation, " Our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory ; " and on this hypothesis alone, with the inspired Apostle he exclaims, " Though sorrowful, yet always rejoicing ! "

To secure His purpose relating to man, by various methods God can urge home to the heart or conscience any one of the several Laws He has established. He who made mind can easily control it, since we know that relating to the creature, creation involves absolute subjection and dependence. It is naturally impossible for Jehovah to make any Moral Being so free that He cannot totally control that being in entire consistency with all its prerogatives and attributes. If creation be a higher exercise of Wisdom and Power than government, as we think all must admit that it is, the assertion that God cannot control his creatures without impairing their functions, must be irrational.

## CHAPTER V.

## SIN.

**SIN** is the transgression of the law requiring Love to fellow-beings as to one's self, and supreme Love to God. The supposition that sin consists in willing and doing what might have been avoided by the sinner is not only unsustained, but palpably contradicted by Scripture; it being no less than half a dozen times affirmed therein, that such as disobeyed God could not have done otherwise; as indeed had they, they would have made the Divine Fore-knowledge false, and the Divine declarations in some instances fore-telling their disobedience untrue. To the children of Israel Joshua said, "Ye cannot serve the Lord, for He is an holy God." Of Joseph's brethren it was said, "They could not speak peaceably unto him." Peter spoke of some, "Having eyes—that could not cease from sin." Said Christ, "It is impossible but that offenses will come, but woe unto that man by whom the offense cometh." The Apostle Paul said, "So then it is impossible for those who are in the flesh to please God." And Jesus Christ said, "A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit."

In face of all these Divine declarations, besides the inspired affirmation that God "worketh all

things after the counsel of his own will," thousands have persevered in asserting that sin consists in doing something which might have been avoided. Though they have seen that in some instances appetite has been so strong as to a thousand times exceed the power of resistance possessed by the agent, as in cases of inebriety, some in the illiberal church, and some in the liberal church, however inconsistently, have steadily held the opinion that sin always can be avoided. From the pulpit and press it has been proclaimed and reiterated, that *all* sin might have been avoided; and hence that Man, from Adam to the close of time, might have avoided giving any necessity or occasion for the Plan of Redemption; for the Counsel of God devising it; for the death of Christ; and the Mosaic economy, as its introduction; and for all the Divine and human expenses for its consummation; and that, by man's thus avoiding sin, all these ample volumes of Divine Purposes and Counsels and Knowledge which were conceived in Eternity, might have been rendered not only unnecessary, but false. What confusion and ruin must there have been, had Man never sinned!

God's definition of sin is, "The transgression of the Law," — not something avoidable by the agent committing it. If the term "Vanity" mean sin as used in the declaration by the Apostle, "The creature was made subject to vanity," as is generally conceded, it follows that Man was made a sinner by his Maker; which view agrees with His hardening Pharaoh's heart, with His "working all things,"

and putting into the human constitution a law in opposition to the law of the mind, and bringing man into captivity to the law of sin and death.

That Man could not obey the Divine Law he was placed under, although transgression of it was Sin, is proved by the words of the Apostle, "For what the Law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." That the Moral instead of the ceremonial Law is here intended, is evident from the righteousness alluded to, which was the love exercised by the holy and enjoined by the Moral Law. 1. The law could not render Man righteous, because it was weak through the flesh; which is only another mode of affirming that Man, who was flesh, and averse to holiness, could not keep it. 2. God condemned Sin, which is here declared to be in the flesh. 3. To supply the want in the Law arising from Human Inability, God sent His Son or instituted and revealed the Gospel, the moral power of which makes the higher Attributes of Man superior to the lower, thus elevating and saving the creature, agreeably to the declared object, the development of the righteousness of the Law. That the most avaricious, sensual, passionate, proud, revengeful, prejudiced, and otherwise grossly sinful men, cannot keep the Divine Law of Love, is too palpable to need proof; and all who know much of others or themselves must admit it in their candid

moments. From the greater reason descends to the lesser, concluding that if the highest amount of contrary influence involves an impossibility of doing a given act, it must also establish the Principle of Necessity; thus showing that the same kind of influence must control conduct in every case in which it exceeds the opposite influences, as the greater amount of weights in either side always moves a scale.

voluntariness to wrong, which is well said to be alone Sin, no basis, root or seed, from which it as naturally sprang through creation, as ever weed or vegetation grew? although the latter was of material growth, while the former was moral. Take the sin of our first Parents,—the type and forerunner of all sin, relating to which the venerable Andover Doctor well says:

“And what other beings placed in the same circumstances and possessing the same natural and moral attributes, would not have done as they did?”

Must not the reflection by every creature, that had he possessed the same attributes, and been placed in the same circumstances, himself would have done as every transgressor has, show the unreasonableness of the retribution for sin so generally contended for? Adam was not the author of either his attributes or his circumstances. If as Dr. Woods well says, “Like Causes in like circumstances will (and we add *must*) produce like Effects,” and if this truth is “too plain to be proved” or self-evident, then must the Sin of Adam, like all subsequent sin of his race, have been regarded by the Creator as a matter of unavoidable Necessity, although voluntary, and as affording no ground of repudiation, abandonment, or unkindness, nor of anything else which would not result in Benefit to the transgressor. We hear it said, “But sinners voluntarily sin.” True; but their Heart, their Purpose, and Voluntariness are all produced through

Nature and Circumstances, resulting as was foreseen and designed through Creation. Are sinners blame-worthy for sinning, as they would have been, had they been created perfect as angels, and then done as they now do? were such a thing possible, which no sane man can believe. Inspiration inquires, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" The answer is, "Not one." Inverted, the proposition is equally true: No one can any more bring an unclean thing out of the clean.

A truthful, and as we think beautiful illustration of this whole subject may be found in the Human Body, which physically corresponds to the soul's moral condition. Man's body as he receives it from the hand of his Maker, is subject to unavoidable disorder, which involves corresponding suffering, and entitles the sufferer to pity and remedial treatment. Man's soul or spirit-nature, is also made imperfect, and subject to unavoidable moral disorder or sin, which involves moral suffering in exact correspondence to its extent. This moral disorder the Apostle calls, "Sin in the flesh;" which may sustain the view that sin is always unavoidable to a being connected with flesh, when unsustained by Divine influence, and compounded as Man is.

The doctrine that sin is in the flesh or corporeal system of Man, is perfectly analogous to the teachings of experience. Every one knows that his physical condition greatly affects his disposition, so much so that it is impossible for him to manifest the same amenity of character when indisposed, as when in the best health. Said a distinguished

Physiologist, "Many a terrible edict has been sent forth through the excitement of a gastric nerve." As flesh-food will render dogs rapacious, so will diet affect human dispositions.

There is a beautiful analogy existing between the Physical and the Moral World. How aptly do storms, tempests, earthquakes, inundations, lightnings, thunders, volcanoes, diseases, the rapacious and varied aspects of the brute kingdom, alternations of seasons, light and darkness, the face of the Earth, the incessant and gigantic conflict between organic and inorganic Matter, and the productions of the Earth, to carry the comparison no farther, illustrate the Moral Condition of our world! All these features doubtless belonged to the Original Creation, instead of being introduced at the Fall, as can be scientifically demonstrated; thus being the Cause of Sin, instead of its Effect. How herculean, widely extended, and innumerable are the moral antagonistic Powers, every where lifting their huge arms like towering Alps, and battling like Milton's angels! Such is the great Conflict of Ages, of which all Moral antagonism in Earth is but the detail, and all physical antagonism is but the type. Is it not too apparent, that prevailing Moral Disorder is only a feature corresponding to the Physical, and belonging to this world as appropriately as storms rage most beneath a tropical sky? Do not Moral disorders in all countries and climates, perfectly correspond to the Physical? Were it far wrong to believe that sinlessness was never Divinely designed for Moral Beings in this world, or that

such a state is as impossible to Man, as sin is in heaven? If it be asked, why such a World of Sinners and of moral conflict was deemed best, we must humbly acknowledge Human Inability to fully comprehend the subject; although the glorious and eternal turrets of the skies, gilded by the rays of the ever-shining Divine Love, seem more beautiful, when laying their foundations low as Earth and Sin, than when laid half, a third; or an hundredth-part of the way to Heaven! But this is not our appropriate field of thought. The brute creation suffers with Man, and the infant no less than the adult; while some mere children endure more pain during a short life, than others who live longest. These varied results are to be traced to their respective laws, physical, social, and intellectual, etc.; instead of the moral law serving as a compensating scale to equalize all the enjoyment of human life according to moral character as a rule. The suffering of brutes, of infants and idiots, may well teach, that temporary pain wherever found, has ends higher than the moral improvement of its subject; as a dark fore-ground renders the light of a picture the more brilliant.

- The question of the full proportion of Retribution to the amount of transgression, has justly received the most careful attention. On our hypothesis, not only the *fact* of punishment for *every* transgression is fully set forth, but also the most perfect *equality* of the amount of Suffering to the amount of Moral Disorder. On the supposition that all threatenings against Sin are executed in the present life, in some

minds embarrassment has existed, expressed as follows: "An individual, from his cradle to his grave, "possesses the most vicious character imaginable, "and finally closes his sinful career by destroying "a whole neighborhood or a nation by poison, and "at the same time killing himself: In that case, "how is his reward, according to his desert as "others are punished, experienced in this life?" The answer is easy and satisfactory on the hypothesis, that suffering as a penalty in all cases is according to the amount of moral disorder, or sinfulness. The punishment inheres to the Moral disorder, just as animal pain inheres to Physical Disorder. As he who commits the greatest crimes, which are the outward and obvious symptoms of Moral Disorder, must possess the greatest degree of it, corresponding to those symptoms, so also must his temporal experience be in accordance with that degree; the worst man always suffering the most. As is true relating to the pain of physical disorder or sickness, so the suffering caused by sin ceases with temporal life, agreeably to the declaration of the Apostle, "He that is dead is freed from sin," and the Scripture doctrine, that sin is in the flesh. Whether a man is more or less sinful, death terminates both his physical and moral pain, alike; at once separating him from the cause of both, namely: the flesh; and in both respects alike, the most disordered, whether regarding moral or physical condition, having suffered most by those causes, respectively. The Apostle said, "I know that in me, that is in my *flesh*, dwelleth no good thing."

"The *flesh* lusteth against the spirit,—and these are contrary the one to the other, so that we cannot do the things that we would." "So then, it is impossible for those who are in the *flesh* (wholly under its dominion) to please God." "For sin (God) condemned sin in the *flesh*." "I find another law in my *members* (the flesh) waring against the law of my mind." "That which is born of the *flesh*, is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit, is spirit." "Who shall deliver me from this *body* (the flesh) of sin and death?" "It (the body) is sown in *dis-honor*, it is raised in glory." As being in the flesh, or body, sin must be thrown off with the body, after the moral disorder of the flesh, like natural disorder, shall have caused an amount of suffering in exact correspondence therewith.

As the Unavoidableness or necessity of disease of the body does by no means abate or lessen the suffering caused thereby, so does not the Necessity and Unavoidableness of Sin or Moral disorder with its fruit, in the least abate or lessen the suffering caused by it. In both cases alike the consequences inhere to the disorder, and cannot be separated from it. The question of avoidableness or unavoidable-ness cannot alter the Nature or the Effects of animal disease; and as little has any similar question to do with the known Effects of Moral disorder. Voluntariness even, is not necessary to the just condemnation or the guilt of Man, much less then a Possibility to avoid the action procuring condemnation. This view is by no means peculiar to us. To cite no farther from numerous sources on the

point, a writer in the Baptist Christian Review, Vol. xxx. p. 252, declares :

“ Impure affections and unholy passions are condemned on account of their own nature ; they bring with them guilt, even where they spring up without any evil intention of the Agent, and where his Will has had no concern in their production.”

Here is the ground taken by a very respectable author, that God’s Law condemns, and that Man is guilty for that which he had no agency in producing, and what consequently was unavoidable by him. All must perceive that conduct and volition may as justly be condemned and involve guilt, although equally unavoidable. God condemns all tendency to sin and its development ; having no pleasure in it, in itself considered ; although He wills it for the good it works.

We now come to the question, What does man merit for his Moral disorder or Sin ? Considering Sin, as we must, as resulting from the Divine appointment and causation no less than does bodily disease, our answer is, that, as a sick man deserves a remedy, and not what will render him the more miserable, so does a sinful man deserve a cure for his Moral disorder, instead of any vindictive treatment, such as many suppose God uses toward the disobedient, unmingled with good to the punished. Such in our view is all punishment,—only another name for a remedy, being the moral medicine appropriate to cure a moral disease. Here is seen a perfect correspondence between the Divine treat-

ment of the disobedient, and the fact proclaimed throughout the universe, namely: that sin could exist, and does exist, only by a Divine Purpose, — Jehovah for wise reasons first making the Creature, as the Apostle declares, “subject to Vanity” or Sin; and when Sin has answered its designed good purpose parentally applying a sanative means which is designed and sure to remove all moral disorder. How different is this from Jehovah’s first, as the younger Edwards affirms, and as far the greater part of the Christian World believe, “Efficiently Primarily Causing all things,” even Volition, by a law establishing a connection between motives and volition, and then inflicting real and unmingled evil upon man, for determining and acting, as it is not in the nature or capacity of any creature to avoid doing, just as He had caused him to do. It should never be forgotten that, at least three fourths of all those who consign the disobedient to endless suffering for sin, believe that God is the author or cause of all things, not excepting Sin itself, and of every feature, modification, or item of the case, on account of which they attempt to justify such a penalty! After noticing the doctrine of Universal Divine Efficiency, which he endorses, President Pond, whom we shall consider an authorized exponent of Orthodoxy, proceeds to say:

“We know that it will be said, as it has been a thousand times, that if all this is true, then farewell to Human Freedom. God in this view, is the only Agent in the Universe. Man is a mere irresponsible machine. He may be the subject of

"passive motion, but not of free voluntary action."  
 "But to objections of this nature, we oppose another of the strong positions of Edwards, namely: "that the will is essentially, and in its own nature "free."\*

What do New England Orthodox and the Calvinistic world mean by freedom? Do they mean that it is Morally possible for any creature to act contrary to "the general law establishing a connection between Motives and Volitions," by which God "is the Efficient Cause of Volition in Man?" Would that the whole world understood them to mean as they undoubtedly must, allowing that one is a Moral cause, and the other a Material one, "that the Will is essentially, and in its own Nature Free," as having moral ability to decide only as it does; just as water is essentially and in its own nature free, as being possible to run only down an inclined plane, or as a magnetic needle is possible to move only as it is attracted; according to the younger Edwards, Motives as necessarily causing Volition as gravitation causes the motion of water, or attraction the movement of the needle. Will Dr. Pond have the Infinite Maker who thus causes all things, Eternally punish His creatures for willing and doing as He *causes* them to do by this general law establishing a connection between Motive and Volition, which he believes man has no moral power adequate to break? Dr. Pond says, of possibility to act different:

\* Lit. & Theo. Review, 1834, p. 536.

“If God knows all future actions and things, then it is certain beforehand that they will all take place.” “The previous certainty of actions is manifestly inconsistent with their contingency; since what is previously certain, must, and will take place.”

We cannot suppress the painful conviction that the utterance of the sentiment, that the Will is “essentially free,” in justification of the prevalent dogma of Eternal Punishment, is only a kind of shuffle or feint designed for effect; since as those who use the phrase define freedom, it by no means reaches to within all space wide-extent of the case it refers to. Dr. Woods, of their own communion says:

“Freedom of Will, as now commonly understood, is an essential property of a Moral Agent, and denotes a freedom from physical force.”\*

When an objection against Eternal Punishment and Vindictiveness inflicted by the Creator, is urged as based upon the Divine Efficiency or Causation relating to Human Volitions, Dr. Pond replies by asserting the Freedom of the Human Will from Physical force!

But we can pardon the Dr., when he repents, on the ground of the general law, “establishing a connection between Motives and Volitions,” in which we firmly believe. After admitting, as truth compels him to do, that God is the Efficient Cause of even Human Volitions, when asked how, on such

\* Lit. & Theo. Review, 1835, p. 273.

grounds, he can justify any punishment that is not purely remedial, probably he finds himself in a close place; and the Law of Motive and Volition, which is established, and hence cannot be resisted, morally influences him to adroitly substitute a piece of *clay* where another material would alone fit.

Some people seem to think that this subject is dry and unimportant, but we think far otherwise; believing that, could the great honest mass see this subject in its true light; see that God really is the Author of all things, causing all Human Volitions not excepting the sinful, they would immediately throw away the idea that the Creator will punish His creatures forever, for what He Himself causes, or punish at all in the sense they now hold. We believe that this is the great lever which is yet to overturn the self-styled Evangelical Church, placing it on the right basis. We have besought believers in Eternal punishment to inform us of the *hinge* or *pivot* on which it can be made consistent with justice, on the only tenable hypothesis of the Divine Government; but have besought in vain. We know that some one would have told us, could they have done so. On the plan of Arminianism, or the equally unreasonable and unscriptural idea of a possibility to do, or not do an act; to act either according to nature or against nature; either according to motives or against all motives; since according to this view, man may always sin, we know that Eternal punishment may reasonably exist. And yet if the connection between Nature and development can be broken so that conduct and char-

acter may be in discordance with both Nature and Motives, why may not all connections, dependencies, and concord whatever be broken up as well? and hence amidst the general wreck of Connection between Cause and Effect, of logic and argumentation, Suffering may cease to follow Sin!

All Holiness is necessitated. The revealed certainty that any of the Human family will be saved involves the principle that the conduct and character of such is unavoidably subject to Control; since if such as are certain to be saved can and may avoid obedience, should they do so how is their certain salvation in that case possible? The certainty of their being saved once settled, that certainty becomes a rule, to which the conduct and character essential to salvation must be conformed. To say that a certainty of future salvation is consistent with a Possibility that those certain to be saved may continue in Sin, involves, either that men can be saved in their sins, or that, relating to the same event, the certainty of its existence is consistent with its uncertainty; which is plain contradiction. Hence for any one professing to believe that the salvation of a part or the whole of the human family is certain, to say that the conduct and character of those certain to be saved may possibly be avoided, is inconsistent, and hence absurd.

The same luminous and irrefragable argument may be applied with equal force to all Moral Beings of the highest grade, who are certain to be Eternally Holy and happy in Heaven. If it be certain that these exalted inhabitants of the heavenly

Jerusalem will steadfastly remain in Harmony and Love, it is no more possible for any one of them to deviate from perfect moral purity, than to change a certainty into an uncertainty, or to convert Heaven itself into its moral antipode ; which few will have, either the mental stupidity or the moral hardihood to affirm. We know not how it may be with others, but for ourself upon such premises and conclusions, our mind reposes in entire confidence, equal to what is due to any mathematical demonstration.

## CHAPTER VII.

## HUMAN KNOWLEDGE OF THE SUBJECT.

WE are sometimes asked, "Have we fathomed the depths of our being, and laid them all bare so as to name every element within us, as we name the wheels in a machine? Have we descended to the very bottom of our spiritual existence, found out the primordial germs of the soul and traced every vital filament that connects it back with the existence of the Creator, so that we can tell in clear scientific phrase, just how it operates? Or have we seen through all the laws by which we live, move, or have our being as separate personalities, but still in Him?"\*

Intellectual Philosophy has traced Mind by the same laws which govern our investigations of Matter, namely: through the effects which it produces. No one can rationally doubt that there is as much mystery in Matter as in Mind, or that the Understanding, the Will and the Affections in Man, with the action of the will, called Volition, as produced instrumentally by motives, are as well understood as the wheels of any Material Mechanism, and as clearly as we see that water, steam, or manual

\* See Dr. B.'s Article, vide p. 27.

power moves a machine. Whatever we do not know of Man, we know enough to be certain that he is absolutely Necessitated in all his Volitions and Actions. It were absurd to deny or doubt what we do know, on account of what we do not know; for that were to ignore all that is useful in Science, Literature and Art.

“ Say first of God above, or man below,  
“ What can we reason, but from what we know ? ”

What would we think of him who should say to the artisan, “ Do not say sir, that the water-wheel “ is necessitated and moved by the water. True; it “ seems that it is so; but have you descended to “ the very bottom of material existence, found out “ the primordial germs of the wheel, and traced “ every vital filament that connects it back with “ the existence of the Creator, so that you can tell “ in clear scientific phrase, just how it operates? Or “ have you seen through all the Laws by which the “ wheel has its being, as a separate individuality, “ but still in Him ? ” We might be surprised to hear the Doctor as above, speak of any “ connection ” of Man with God; since in the same article he says :

“ Were we to take the doctrine of necessity as “ adequately expressing all there is in the case, and “ stop at the conclusion that every volition of ours, “ every movement of our minds, every act, is but a “ fixed link in the chain of causes and effects, which “ runs forth from God and constitutes the uni- “ verse — let this be regarded as the *whole* of the

"matter, and we are brought to Pantheism at once."

But if Man is certainly connected with God as an Effect is connected with its Cause, and if "every volition of ours, every movement of our minds, every act," is certainly connected with us as an Effect is connected with a secondary Cause, then must not Man be the connecting link through which "every volition of ours, every movement of our minds, every act, runs forth" as a chain from God? We affirm that this is the "*whole* of the matter;" that there is nothing true relating to the *whole* universe, which is not included in the Chain of Being which is traced back directly to God alone, as the only source of whatever exists. But if the Doctor has indeed found something which did not proceed from God, and hence cannot be traced back to Him, we hope he will communicate the discovery to the world, as a thousand times more interesting than any other known specimen! Whatever proceeds from Man must have been first received by him, or he must have created it. If Man can create any quality, feature, or whatever else belongs to matter or mind, then he can create every feature, quality, and essence of mind, and hence is equal to God; who alone has been thought to be capable of creating. He who created Matter and Mind created whatever is true relating to them; all truth relating to actual existence being necessarily included in it.

We repeat that the conclusion "that every volition of ours, every movement of our minds, every

“act, is but a fixed link in the chain of causes and “effects which runs forth from God and constitutes “the Universe,” must be regarded as the *whole* of the matter, or something must have proceeded from *nothing*, or from some other being besides God, which was not put into that being, and which some creature must have created! Will the Doctor believe the latter? He must; or repudiate what he wrote.

Nor is anything analogous to Pantheism possible even to be tacked to the conclusion, that every thing existing in matter or mind, or relating to them, proceeds from God, as Effects from an Efficient Primary Cause.

What is Pantheism? Noah Webster defines it, “The doctrine that the universe is God.” Is the tracing of all spiritual and material existences, with whatever qualifies, relates to them, or results from them back to God as their sole primary efficient cause, the same as affirming that the universe is God? Will the Doctor affirm that these two propositions are identical? He must; or retract his statement. If whatever God causes is Himself, even the Doctor must admit that part of the universe is God; since he will hardly deny that some part of the Universe, if not all of it, is to be traced back to God as its sole producer, without any known intermediate instrumentality. If God can cause part of the Universe to exist, without that part becoming part of Himself, then may He as well cause all existence, and whatever relates to it, without the least item of the whole becoming part

and parcel of Himself. How strangely do great men sometimes use, or rather abuse language!

Here is another sentiment from Dr. B. "We must confess however, that when they are developed independently of each other, when each one is argued out straight forward, 'through thick and thin,' without regard to the corresponding facts on the opposite side, they do indeed run far apart, and end in different results; Necessity in Pantheism, and Free-Will in egotistic Atheism."

The first remarkable feature of this extract is that it substantially assumes that both Free-Will and Necessity are true! He speaks of "each" being argued out without regard to the "corresponding facts on the opposite side." If the opposite side of each has "facts," then each side must be true; since no Fact can belong to what is false. This quotation is in agreement with the character of the whole article which, with deference to the author, would seem to have been designed to so completely infold one doctrine with the other as to lead the advocates of both Free-Will and Necessity to shake hands together, in the delusion that their views were the same,—a purpose *if* cherished far more creditable to Charity than to Mental Ability.

If the Doctor meant the Liberty which is defined by Dr. Woods as "Freedom from mere *Physical* restraint," it were easy to see that such Freedom is perfectly consistent with Necessity. But this he evidently does not mean, for such Free-Will can never be driven, even "through thick and thin," into

Atheism, and nobody controverts the existence in Man of such Liberty. Instead of Free-Will or Liberty as Dr. Woods defines it, he obviously means Possibility to the opposite side; to do different from what is done. That such Free-Will has any facts corresponding with it, which must involve that itself is true, is totally inconsistent, and hence unreconcilable with the doctrine of Necessity in any form; since he must be bold indeed, and foolish as bold, who will affirm that Possibility of action either way, and Necessity are reconcilable with each other.

That Free-Will, as generally understood, involving a Possibility to either side, though driven through nothing thicker or more dense than the tail of a comet, whether in regard or "disregard to the corresponding facts on the opposite side," results in egotistic Atheism we cannot doubt, since this is substantially the view taken in these pages.

But the assertion that Necessity alone can be "driven," so as to result in Pantheism, can easily be proved untrue. It is presumed that no Necessity can be more absolute than that which impels the Material Worlds composing the Universe in their respective orbits. Moreover Physical Laws absolutely controlling Matter without voluntariness or will, are established and maintained by Divine Power; so that God alone sends magnificent systems rolling through the spheres. Having Necessity in its most absolute form thus placed in full view, we now urge the inquiry, whether there be a vestige of Pantheism in all this? If so, then indeed

must Pantheism be true; for no one ever denied that such Necessity relating to all the Motions of the Planets exists.

Let us see any one, not excepting Dr. B. himself, lay the Moral Necessity on any "thicker," or drive it harder "through thick and thin," or in greater disregard of any "corresponding facts" or even theories "of the opposite side," and by the utmost that can be done, *can mere* Moral Necessity be made to involve Pantheism? any more than does the Physical Necessity which balances and moves the multitudes of worlds. We know that Pantheism involves Necessity, but have seen no proof that Necessity involves Pantheism. Was not this what the Doctor *meant*? though it was not what he said.

Never was a healthy spaniel more unjustly dealt with by being falsely accused of hydrophobia, than this heaven-born daughter of truth, the doctrine of Necessity, has been wronged by this mad-dog cry of "Pantheism!" As indicated by the mysteries of Paganism, and the secret doctrine of ancient philosophers, though disputed by some, Pantheism is supposed to have been the doctrine of the poet Orpheus, and other early Greeks, who call the world "The body of Jupiter." Says the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, "From this notion probably arose the doctrine of two First Principles in the Oriental Philosophy." If the doctrine of Control or Necessity, however absolute, involves that the thing controlled is the body of the controller, then must the grind-stone be the body of the boy

who turns it; or, in more strict accordance with the distinguished American Lexicographer, the boy himself!

Some may tell us that Nature revolts at the doctrine that God is the Primary Efficient Cause of all things. We do not doubt that people educated into a belief in the absurdities of Arminianism will revolt even at Truth; but this is too hollow ground for the rejection of any thing. It is as difficult to tell what the revoltings of nature, as distinguished from the acquired tastes are, as in every case to tell what results from Nature, as distinguished from the impressions made by revelation; and hence in general we place but little dependence on this criterion. What one man can see clearly, another cannot perceive in any degree; education rendering many things plain which, without it, never could have been known; besides the original powers of different minds greatly varying; one man excelling in one particular, another in a different way, a third being but mediocre, and so on.

The Author of the "Conflict of Ages" contends, that Man's sense of Honor and of Right revolts at the idea, that our Maker made new-created beings so that they would Necessarily Sin; and because he sees that man in this world is in such a condition, therefore concludes that man is not a new-created being; but had a pre-existent state, and therein misbehaved himself! Nature revolts not at the doctrine that God Necessitated Man to Sin, as was best that he should; but at the idea that Sin in any case involves suffering which will not result

in good, and prove beneficial to the sufferer. We think it far more agreeable to both Philosophy and Scripture to conclude, that all punishment is Remedial and Necessitated with Sin, than to account for what we know to be Necessitating Causes of Sin, by the absurdity of a pre-existent state; and that the Doctor ere long will believe so. A simple contrast of the Symmetry, Harmony, and Beauty of our system, with the gross contradictions, antagonisms, and inconsistencies of all others, is alone enough, aside from prejudice, to secure its adoption.

Before dismissing the point of nature's revoltings it must be confessed, that there are some points upon which all must agree, as relating to what is repugnant to reason. We will state a case:

On the hypothesis of a very large proportion of the Christian World, namely: that God is the Author or Cause of all Human Volition and Character,—a doctrine as we have seen amply sustained by Reason, and Scripture,—for God to make Man eternally miserable, or punish him in any way not conducive to his happiness, must place the Father of all in as revolting a light as if He punished endlessly without any sin having been committed by the punished. If God cause the Volition which is Sin, how can that character which Primarily Efficiently depends on Himself be any justification for inflicting unmingled evil upon the instrument in whom it is unavoidable, and by whom He accomplishes His Purpose? If He is the Cause of both the Sin and the Eternal Punishment of it, must He not be as unjust as if He made the crea-

ture He brings into being as miserable at the moment of birth, without any sin existing in the Universe?

In his recent work, the younger Beecher expresses the opinion that a known fact ought to be rejected, sooner than violate reason and the moral sense, which revolt at it. At this state of the case we will propose a question: Can any proposition be imagined more revolting to reason and the moral sense, than the doctrine that Infinite Love will make His offspring eternally miserable for putting forth those very Volitions which Himself Causes? which proposition, as we have seen, must be as discordant with Reason and Conscience, as to punish in the same manner without any Sin having been committed. Certain as we are, that nothing more absurd or morally odious can be imagined, even should the Doctor both see and feel the pit of Eternal torment, as a Necessitarian, according to his own theory, he must deny the fact of its reality, rather than violate the God-given senses of reason and rectitude, by admitting it. If he be a candid man, he must call upon all his communion who receive the sentiment of the Universal Divine Efficiency, to come forward and deny the doctrine of Eternal torment, even though it were a fact!

It is worthy of profound attention, that a D.D. of high standing in the very Metropolis of orthodoxy within a few weeks, instead of attempting to justify God in the infliction of Vindictive punishment upon the vulgar hypothesis of a possibility to either

side, has rather resorted to the unheard of, and monstrous hypothesis of a Pre-Existence of the Human Family; thus thrusting a plank *backwards* beyond the commencement of time through which he vainly attempts to reconcile with the Divine Goodness, the doctrine of Necessitarianism, as connected with eternal Suffering. Discriminating persons must perceive that the Doctor suspends the whole weight of the Orthodox view of future punishment upon the idea of a pre-existent state, and that if this strand, composed of nothing, fails him, by his own acknowledgement made in the entire volume, on his hypothesis the whole superstructure of any other than remedial suffering falls with it. He evidently knew that Necessitarianism was true. Relating to all who come into this world, so far as character and eternal destiny are concerned he has defended the Divine administration of such a Necessitarian system, with Orthodox eternal damnation annexed. It is truly wonderful that he did not perceive that the doctrine of Philosophical and Scriptural Necessity as much embarrassed the hypothesis of a Fall in any pre-existent state as in this, and that it is impossible to justify the system of the Orthodox view of punishment by any such method. Dr. Beecher's book proves that our representation of what Orthodoxy is, as involving the most absolute Necessitarianism, is correct; while it has done nothing to help the advocates of Eternal punishment out of the dilemma they are placed in, by asserting that God can justly punish His creatures forever for doing what He Necessitates them to do, or pun-

ish at all, only as the means of a certain removal of Moral Disorder at a proper time. He has helped others to expose the hideous deformity of his Church's Theology, without the least success in repairing the unsoundness he has exposed.

On page 169, of the sentiment "That God, as a sovereign, and for general ends, first caused Adam to sin, and then, because he sinned under the power of this Divine Efficiency, He proceeded by a like efficiency to cause all of his posterity to sin in all their actions, and always continues so to do, except when He sees fit to cause holy actions by the same Divine energy," he says: "This view is properly rejected by numerous opponents, on the ground that it would be unjust to reward or punish volitions so created; that it tends to destroy a sense of accountability, and that it is inconsistent with all just ideas of free agency and the liberty of the will."

But notwithstanding he thus disposes of this sentiment, on pp. 173-4, of both the old and the new School Orthodox, he says:

"The thing done is this, as is agreed on both sides. God, in consequence of Adam's act,—an act preceding the personal existence of all men,—has, in some way, brought it to pass, that all men, without fail in any one case, do sin, and come into a state of utter and endless ruin, unless they are saved from it by supernatural and special grace. Moreover, it is conceded that it was God's Purpose and Design to effect this, and in some way He established a system or a constitution by

“which it was effected. In this fact, it is said, — a fact conceded by both sides, — the main, and great difficulty lies.”

Several things in the above, merit attention. Here is the Doctor's unequivocal and full testimony that both parties in the Orthodox and Presbyterian church agree, that the Creator, in some way, “has brought it to pass; and that it was God's Purpose and Design that all men, without fail in any one case, do sin and come into a state of utter and endless ruin;” thus making Him the Primary Efficient Cause of Man's Sin, as fully and clearly as our system does, and as obviously involving that sin is absolutely unavoidable. The reader will observe also, that this view, held by the whole Orthodox and Presbyterian church, in all its points, is no less liable to the objections, “That it would be unjust to reward or punish Volitions so created; that it tends to destroy a sense of accountability; and that it is inconsistent with all just ideas of Free-Agency, and the Liberty of the Will,” than the other doctrine first noticed by the Doctor, to which, as fatal to it, he applies those objections. It will be seen that it is only the sense of “reward, and punishment,” of “accountability,” “free-agency, and the liberty of the will,” as *erroneously* held, and not as we have explained them in this volume, which is inconsistent with the doctrine of the Universal Divine Efficiency Causing Sin. Is it not strange, that the Doctor allows himself to speak of “just ideas of Free-Agency and the Liberty of the Will,” and of “Accountability, Rewards and Pun-

"ishment," as inconsistent with Necessitarianism, when he includes it from first to last in his book! A Necessity of all men to sin, is involved in the doctrine of both Schools of Orthodoxy, as well as that God's Plan includes sin and ruin, as Dr. B. has above stated. Having so long been in the denomination, we suppose he must have held what was common to both schools; besides he often declares that the fact that Man from infancy is totally impotent and averse to Holiness, as held by the Reformers and the Orthodox of the present day, is one of the *facts* not to be gotten rid of, which could never be shown to be consistent with Honor and Right in the Deity on the Orthodox hypothesis of the Fall, and which he proposes to adjust by the introduction of his new doctrine of a human pre-existence. In addition to this he unsparingly applies the doctrine of Moral Necessity to God, as follows: "He [God] has in His mind an Eternal "and immutable Law of Honor and Right which "He cannot disregard." "It is therefore an Infinite "Necessity in God's own Nature, that He should "obey the Laws of Honor and of Right." p. 27. "He [God] cannot but observe the True Principles "of Honor and of Right." p. 49. He applies moral necessity, as we have explained it, to Man, as follows: "There must be in Man some Adequate "Cause, before Action, for a course of action "so "universal, so powerful, so contrary to right." p. 71. "The mere power of choice and external temptation "seem insufficient to explain a course of action so "contrary to reason, so obstinate, so general, so "ruinous." p. 89.

But if Free-Agency, Liberty, or the Power of Choice, alone can cause the least degree of character or conduct either right or wrong, all must see that these simple attributes alone, are adequate to produce any amount of character; so that the Doctor on this hypothesis, need not look for any other adequate cause of the prevailing wickedness. The mere allusion to "an Adequate Cause," other than "the Power of Choice," shows that *this* Power alone can cause nothing, and the Doctor will admit, we think, that an "adequate cause" always necessitates its effects; unless he would make Man more free than God; whom, as above, he represents as being under an "Infinite Necessity" to act right. We respectfully recommend to this Author to adopt consistent views of Accountability, Retribution, &c; which he will find far more effectual to adjust all the facts and truths he has set forth, than the heathen notion of a transmigration of Human souls! We are obliged to him for the merited disgrace he has helped to put upon the prevailing Orthodoxy; although we cannot but consider his book too much like a wilderness which, if it have any trees of stately growth pleasant to look upon, and raising their tops far into the clear blue heavens, at the same time is so densely covered with under-brush, as to never afford an agreeable walk for the student, and much less for the pleasure-seeker, while it may reward the industrious reader with some rare specimens of antiquated Christian faith!

## CHAPTER VIII.

## MORAL TENDENCY OF THE SYSTEM.

THE irrefragable, abundant, and clear proof by which the doctrine of Necessity is sustained, leaves no ground of rational fear relating to its Moral Tendency. Of all Scripture Truth this most conduces to Humility, Veneration and Faith. To creatures Jehovah says, "Be still, and know that I am God. I will be exalted among the heathen; I will be exalted in the earth."

In no way nor to the least degree does this system, either lessen the Motives to Holiness or add to any Cause of disobedience. It does not lessen the amount of suffering by Sin; every transgression having its just recompense of reward. Moral disorder which results in Sin is as burdensome, and as intolerable a load, greivous to be borne, on this system as any other. As relating to the disorder of the body, a fever, colic, epilepsy, cholera, or any other disease remains the same, whatever be the hypothesis according to which it is viewed,—the manner by which it is caused not at all varying the thing itself,—so relating to moral disorder and Sin, the *Cause* of them, whether it be Contingency or Divine Efficiency, does not at all vary them, or their well known effects.

Present to us the greatest moral monster earth ever knew; a thousand times more steeped in crime than Nero, or the worst of all that horde who bore the culminating fruit of a hundred wicked generations, blossoming and going to seed in the murder of God's only Son! In presence of such a sinner we must still affirm, That this whole deformed mass had a corresponding germ in Creation, and its maturity by murky springs of turbid waters flowing at its root, and in an atmosphere densely charged with poisonous exhalations and unhealthful moral malaria, without which as a cause it could never have grown, and in, and around which nothing existed to prevent it. We have no fear of making this individual any worse, by such an announcement. With all his evil,—and we would not bate a jot,—if such a declaration affect him at all, as we incline to think it must, most probably it will bring him to a dead stand in astonishment; realizing that, little as he had imagined such a thing, he holds a connection with the Infinite One, whose Moral antipode he is, of which he had seldom, if ever before dreamed. This very discovery; its exceeding brightness of True Philosophy, surpassed by only the Divine Benevolence which shines in it, while it amuses him, if it do not captivate his Intellect, may dart a purifying ray into his heart, and prove to be the forerunner and the earnest of a greater change than that experienced by Saul of Tarsus.

But suppose the reverse is true: What if he falsely say, "Well; I am not so bad as my neigh-

bars, and my own Conscience sometimes would persuade me that I am." Will not the false flattery be as soon dissipated as morning mists, by the unmistakeable signs of Moral Disorder gnawing at his vitals, no less than operating to injure others; as the fond delusions indulged by the Consumptive fly before the heraldic insignia of approaching dissolution? Whether true or false, our doctrine can never obliterate from Human History and Experience the truth, "There is no peace saith my God to the wicked." What if this man attempt to excuse himself from repentance by a perverse use of the most blessed Doctrine ever revealed? Will it be the first case of holding truth in unrighteousness, or an unheard of abuse of a Scripture Truth? Do not wicked men every day abuse the Divine Forbearance; making it the occasion of persistent sinning? Will such a wresting of a Bible sentiment justify any one in rejecting it? So soon as the heart is made better, will not wicked men cease to wrest the Doctrine of Moral Necessity no less than other Truth, to their own destruction? as has been proved by the lives of holy men, living and dying in it. When our opponents show one feature of misapplication of this Article of Faith not found relating to other Truth, we will attempt a more extended explanation not needed at present.

Let him who complains of the tendency of this system candidly ask himself, whether the so called Evangelical theory which teaches that Man comes into the world totally depraved, in which state he

must continue in rebellion until, irrespective of his will, by a sovereign act his Maker regenerates him, does not as much involve fatalism, and hence in that respect, must not have as evil a moral tendency as the doctrine contended for in these pages. On the prevailing Orthodox or Arminian system, according to which as defined by Mr. Wesley, reprobation and election existed before the foundation of the world, vide p. 24, either the depraved nature of Man given him by his Maker or the sovereign act of unsought regeneration determines all human character, and eternal destiny as much as, according to Necessitarianism the Divine Agency determines them ; although with this important difference, that while the self-styled Evangelical view refers all to the Divine appointment either through depraved nature or Divine grace, it represents the Creator as also Eternally Punishing part of His offspring whom He thus absolutely controls, while He saves others only because he made them to differ ! Let the candid reader ask himself, whether such a view of the Deity will as much promote admiration, love, and obedience, as the view that, to secure the greatest possible good of all, our Maker made Man subject to vanity or sin, and at the same time provided a remedy for moral disorder certain to remove it so soon as it shall have answered its end, and elevate all men to eternal glory and felicity with Himself. The conviction that all that is endured in mind or body will prove beneficial, must arm pain with Omnipotent power to draw the spirit to God, instead of operating as it does on the other system, to

repel Man farther and farther from his Maker; as we are told judicial treatment of the wicked does eternally operate.

How plainly does Mr. Wesley declare in the 8th Article of the Methodist Discipline, that Man has no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God; in other words, to secure heaven, without God prevents sin and works in him a good will; which as all must see, amounts to the so called Evangelical view of Regeneration; thus plainly teaching that those whom God does not regenerate must go to endless death; being precisely the Calvinistic Orthodox ground of Andover, as taught by Dr. Woods and others. The following quotations will show that in this particular we do not in the least misrepresent others:

“Is it not a revealed fact in the Bible, that “wherever true love to God takes possession of the “heart, it in no instance results from the Will of “Man, but is uniformly the result of the Holy Spirit’s influence?”\* ”

Relating to Regeneration which on the Calvinistic plan secures heaven to all who experience it, Orthodox Dr. Griffin says: “Nor does the sinner “co-operate in producing this change—but his “heart, which in the sight of God is the whole “man, struggles against the spirit, till the change “is complete.”†

“Whether we can properly speak of depraved

\* Christian Review, (Baptist,) 1843, pp. 251, 252.

† Lectures, p. 163.

"man as *susceptible* of holy affection, while unrenewed . . . Taking words in the fair and common sense, I think we cannot." "If we maintain that man is susceptible of right impressions from Divine truth — *without the regenerating influence of the Spirit*; it will be natural for us to deny or overlook the *necessity* of that influence."\*

If, as Mr. Wesley teaches, man has no ability until God changes his will, it follows that that change which *imparts* a wanting ability must *precede* the exercise of that ability; and hence on the Arminian plan, regeneration must precede all human co-operation with the spirit, or obedience. Origen, of the Alexandrian School taught:

"It is impossible for man at the outset to look to God, for it is necessary that man be, at first, subjected to sin."† "Before man receives the name of son of God, he is destined to death. But when he receives this seal, he is delivered from death and passes to life."‡

These last two quotations the dominant theology urges as the ancient parallel of its faith. The doctrine of the Divine Fore-knowledge, since it clearly reveals moral necessity relating to all actions and character, as much encourages licentiousness as our system, while really, neither does it. We think the conclusion must be, since our view presents the Divine character in a more loveable

\* Dr. Woods, Lit. & Theo. Review, 1834, p. 191-2, 196.

† Origen, Contra Celsum, Lib. III. 62.

‡ Hermas, Pastor, Lib. III.

aspect, that it is more favorable to holiness than that of the dominant theology.

Whatever is most adapted to impress the mind with the idea of the Universal Divine Efficiency, and thus render the image of the Creator in His perfections and operations familiar, until the creature shall

“ See God in clouds and hear Him in the wind,”

and in every thing else both within and without the soul; more especially when this pervading sensibility to the Divine Presence is associated with the conviction that whatever is temporarily disagreeable or painful, no less than what is pleasurable, is kindly intended and certain to promote the individual no less than the general good, we think, while it awakens gratitude, cannot but have a stronger tendency to conform the heart and life to godliness, than the hypothesis that the Creator set up Nature, and then retired far away, in such a manner as cannot admit the idea that all which results from Creation is the expression of the Divine Will. While the former doctrine tends to render Man holy and to excite filial fear to offend God, the latter has an effect to conform the character into likeness to that of the fool, whom David described; as that “ God was not in all his thoughts!” How full of comfort and tenderness is the state of mind naturally induced by the reflection, that Infinite Love is all around us, and in every thing; not less in the most adverse and painful, than in the beautiful blooming violet, sending forth its fragrance and perfume of

God at our feet! We submit to him who has felt the Love of God shed abroad in the heart, whether this be not the language of spontaneous confidence and praise. Experience tells us that the first moment that the chastened soul views God in this full and comprehensive light, witnesses to a new holy pleasure in its Maker, and new delight of hope and joy unspeakable, relating to all the family of Man.

How different is the universe as seen by the Arminian, from what it is as viewed by the believer in Necessitarianism! The Arminian's Universe is like a sadly disordered body; covered over, at least in large spots, with leprosy, tumors, bruises, ulcers, and all manner of deformity, never designed by its Creator; who, though Infinite in Love, in Wisdom and Power, could not prevent them, and for the existence of which there never will have been any good reason, occasion or use! This disorder the Creator is all the while endeavoring to expurge, with the hearty good will to do it at once; but cannot! At such a picture God looks; and while His Infinite Heart throbs with emotion, oceans of tears are shed over this diseased child, and Infinite Hope is only *encouraged* by the remote prospect that a cure may finally be made! All this moral darkness has no other redeeming, or mitigating trait.

On the other hand the Necessitarian, in the heavenly light of truth and full orb'd Divine Perfections, sees the same Universe, only with this all heaven-wide difference,—that every disorder, deformity and moral obliquity, with all their relative ill effects, are only what the Creator chose, purposed and pro-

vided for, as the best method for the ultimate production of the good which Infinite Love delighted in. To his desponding brother, in the beautiful language of Pope, he exclaims :

“ Cease, then, nor order imperfection name :  
 Our proper bliss depends on what we blame.  
 Know thy own point : This kind, this due degree  
 Of blindness, weakness, heaven bestows on thee.  
 Submit. — In this, or any other sphere,  
 Secure to be as blest as thou canst bear :  
 Safe in the hand of one disposing Power,  
 Or in the natal, or the mortal hour.  
 All nature is but art, unknown to thee ;  
 All chance, direction, which thou canst not see ;  
 All discord, harmony not understood ;  
 All partial evil, universal good.  
 And, spite of pride, in erring reason’s spite,  
 One truth is clear, **WHATEVER IS, IS RIGHT.**”

Were it not that the Arminian, notwithstanding the crudeness of his theology, as shown by his spontaneous prayers and occasional remarks, in his *heart* relies on God as a Particular Disposer of all events and interests, his doctrine would keep his soul in uninterrupted disquiet ; thinking all the while that, in a thousand forms, like howling monsters thirsting for prey, prowling unrestrained over the whole earth, absolute evil threatens to devour the dearest, the greatest, and the most enduring Human welfare ! Take from him this heart-assur-

\* Had the distinguished Author of the Book of Nature understood the “right” here alluded to as, not relating to the Divine Law of Moral Rectitude, but to what is best on the whole, probably he would not have dissented.

ance that all is for the best, which reveals the very doctrine we contend for, and must not the Arminian imitate the miserably tormented victim of *delirium tremens*, in both his visions of horror, and his wretchedness?

The great error of the day consists in bringing down the Divine Attributes and Government to almost a level with the Human; taking a mere figure of speech to mean, that God really is at war with His creatures; that He subdues their rebellion and reduces them to terms, much the same as an earthly government does an insurgent Province; whereas the Divine Government is so extended and perfect, that it prevents all departure from the line marked out by the Wisdom and Goodness of all its Laws, and thus triumphs, not as in a great battle, or one day in an hundred; but at every moment, and in all events; the most minute as well as the vast!

A rule by which we may determine the tendency of any doctrine is the temper or moral condition manifested by the mind at the moment at which its advocate is defending it; the moment when if ever it is present to the mind, and at which, if it can do it at any time, it must soothe a perturbed spirit, and calm the tempests of passion. If a doctrine be heavenly, to the ear and heart of the soul it will whisper, "Let the mind be in you which was also in Christ;" it will say, "Remember He is your brother, although an opponent."

Christ gave us a rule by which to judge of the tendency of any doctrine: "By their fruits ye shall

know them." "Men do not gather grapes of thorns." Are not the Religious Bodies known to most favor the Necessitarian view, and to carry it out farthest in its general bearings, such as the Orthodox, the Calvinistic Baptists, the Presbyterians, especially of the Old School, who are most tenacious on these points, to say the least, quite as exemplary, as well educated, as intellectual and devotional as any who go the farthest in rejecting it? Have not many of the most pious of men, such as Edwards, Payson, Brainerd, Judson, Fuller, Hervey, Carey, Ballou, and multitudes of others, strictly held it? Surely the lives of such men are a sufficient commentary upon the moral tendency of their doctrine! Boardman the missionary, one of the most devoted and gifted of modern men, declared that he regarded himself as under the Divine control as an atom is upborne in the atmosphere.

In the estimation of some, David must have been a very bad man, because he declared of God, "The wrath of man shall praise Thee, and the remainder Thou wilt restrain." That sin, even wrath, should praise Jehovah; that He should restrain what would not praise Him, as if He made a difference even relating to wrath, which is one of the worst kinds of sin, thus showing a sort of approbation of it by at least permitting it, when he would not permit some wrath, in their view must be the essence of an "exploded philosophy" which they have become too wise—"above what is written"—to admit. But this "old philosophy" did not corrupt the man after God's own heart.

This system is in perfect harmony with all that is true in Doctrine, encouraging in Promise, terrific in Threatenings, elevating in Precept, or valuable in Character. In the lives of the greatest and best of men, we behold the perfect consistency of Faith in the Necessitarian scheme with, not only the greatest Christian Humility, Patience, Charity and Self-denial; but with also the most importunate, believing, and persevering Prayer; with the most gigantic and indefatigable Christian Effort; with the utmost Moral Purity ever attained by mortals; and the most refined and effectual Solicitude for the salvation of Man, and the glory of God. The undeniable *fact*, that such eminent men tenaciously held this doctrine, and the other fact that no class has ever been found superior, if equal to them, show the perfect sympathy and mutual dependence existing between Necessitarianism and whatever is most elevated in Christianity, in a much clearer light than they can appear by any mere argument, however logical or convincing. Truth will probably sustain the view, that it furnishes an element in holiness of greater depth, profundity, and completeness, than exists in any other doctrine; Nay; it adds all this, and more, to whatever is excellent in all other systems; besides being free from much that is highly pernicious in them. It was with marked propriety, and the fullest apprehension of the subject, that that most gifted of men, Jonathan Edwards, said:

“ I think that the notion of Liberty, consisting in  
“ a *contingent self-determination of the will*, as

"necessary to the morality of men's dispositions and actions, is almost inconceivably pernicious ; and that the contrary truth is one of the most important truths of Moral Philosophy, that ever was discussed, and necessary to be known."

The high degree of activity, self-sacrifice, and heart-consecration seen in the great Apostle, and most of all in the Distinguished Founder of the Cross, were the necessitated Fruit of the Law of Life, superadded to the Law of Love ; the Law of Christ in the Gospel itself being a necessitating element to the full extent in which it demolishes the strong holds of Satan, as was Purposed, according to the Apostle, before the world began. So far from all this Fruit of Christianity being inconsistent with Necessitarianism, with whatever else is good, it is a necessitating element and instrumentality, as well as being itself necessitated. Does not the Apostle declare, "The Love of Christ *constraineth* us?" Is not constraint necessitating? Peter and John said, "We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard."

There is not a Doctrine, Precept, Promise, or Threat in the Bible, which is intercepted or diverted by this system ; which it would not present to the Understanding, the Heart, and the Conscience, with all possible pungency and amplitude, as the necessitating means of salvation, and a perfect matrice for the corresponding cast of a holy soul !

Wherever true goodness exists the fruit will be the same as that seen in the Apostles. When the Apostle taught the Romans that Sin was the occa-

sion of abounding grace; to the query, "Shall we sin therefore?" he replied, "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" thus teaching that the moral condition alone is the least preventive against sin.

The moral influence of this doctrine is vastly different from that of any other system, relating to the regard it inspires for the erring. When he who holds these views sees one who has gone very far in sin, unlike the contingency scheme, they do not prompt him to pass by on the other side and leave such an one to suffer uncared for, but rather to act like the good shepherd who leaves the whole flock to seek one wanderer; reflecting that, had he possessed the same natural and moral attributes, and been placed in the same circumstances, he too would have acted precisely in the same manner.

Paul spoke of God, "Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which were given us in Christ Jesus before the world began;" but such a view, though it embraced the fundamental principle of the system we contend for, did not corrupt the Apostle. Love and hatred are the two springs of moral action and character. He who loves God will serve Him without hope of servile reward, — he who does not love Him will not serve Him; and that doctrine will most promote holiness which most promotes love. Propensities, or the Moral state, influence men more than doctrines.

At the mere announcement of such a theory,

some may exclaim, "What use for care, or need of "concern in the matter, if the Creator through the "laws of being secures and works all?" Care, hope, and fear, attention, means and efforts, are part of the Divine plan, the agencies, or links in the chain; all being Divinely produced in the mind, and having their use and instrumentalities. When God executes the Purpose to make Man Holy, He uses the means appropriate to produce the convictions, emotions, purposes and acts, which constitute holiness; and as sure as the laws of Gravitation or Electricity operate, the result follows. When He would produce the opposite character as in the case of Pharaoh, He uses corresponding means; and the result is at once secured. As the load-stone is attracted by the steel, so do motives attract the human mind, and certainly result in volition and conduct. The strongest confidence, and reliance in this theory cannot interrupt the connection and efficacy relating to cause and effect, as seen in the development of character. The ardent Lover of Nature could as soon gaze upon the Ocean in a storm; upon the Falls of Niagara; or stretch his eye from the Summit of Mont Blanc, and feel no emotion; as the Necessitarian can contemplate the Varied Operations of Matter and Mind, without his Intellect becoming expanded, or his Heart not being attracted to the Pure!

The believer in Necessitarianism is thereby most naturally led to connect punishment with every violation of the Law of Love, and to fix the truth in his mind, that he cannot be saved, nor enjoy any

blessing dependent upon holiness and obedience, without possessing the pre-requisite condition, or moral state essential to it. The system is highly adapted to elevate and strengthen the intellect; to captivate the affections into subjection to goodness, which he finds himself unable to withstand; viewing every Cause which affects him as the benefactor of himself and the Universe, whether so designed by the immediate agent or not;—and he does not find it in his heart to quarrel with any ministration of good. Thus in his patience he possesses his soul; in every thing giving thanks. On the contrary, Arminianism makes a man morally evil, by a false light relating to what he regards as absolute evil; with carnal weapons fighting whatever crosses his will, “treating the devil to fire;” instead of calmly maintaining his integrity, and overcoming evil with good; being the while unconscious that God’s hand is in all. Only so far as the Divine Spirit dwells in him, and develops a life in accordance with Necessitarianism, however his head may go wrong, can he feel and act like a follower of Christ; whose whole history and character exemplified our theory. Arminianism renders turbid the clearest minds, and intellectually dwarfs a giant.

When we hear the terms, “Personal Agency,” “Free Souls,” &c., &c., it may be well to guard against Ideas involving that any Creature can possibly act contrary to Moral Nature, or be otherwise than controlled by the Creator; through the Laws governing conduct. And when a writer tells us that:

“What God desires to do and will do, answers to, and completes what Man cannot do;” that, “If we read aright the jubilant expressions of the Apostle Paul concerning the grace of the Gospel system, it is not Grace that does every thing for Man;” that “Paul’s Character was in great part his own creation;” and that “The experience of the Apostle lends itself to our position, that character is not a gift, but a self-wrought possession,”\* it may not be amiss to carefully contrast all such sentiments with Scriptures like the following: “Work out your own salvation—for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His own good Pleasure;”† “Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling; not according to our works, but according to His own Purpose and Grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the world began;”‡ “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy hath He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost;”§ “Not of Works, lest any man should boast, for we are His Workmanship, created in Christ Jesus, unto Good Works, which God before ordained, that we should walk in them;”|| “By grace are ye saved, through Faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the GIFT of God;”|| and “Thou hast wrought *all* our works in us.”¶

The Author of “Agencies in Salvation” is fear-

\* Univer. Quar., Art. Agencies Salvation, July, 1853.

† Phil. 2 : 12, 13. ‡ 2 Timo. 1 : 9. § Titus, 3 : 5.

|| Eph. 2 : 8, 9, 10.

¶ Isa. 26 : 12.

ful that too great a Divine pressure in the work of salvation will lessen the value of the article ; since he says, "It should seem too, that the Agencies must "not be so powerful as to reduce the value of the "product." Whether this caution is based upon the idea that holiness is an article which may be bruised or torn, like cloth, we know not ; but whatever is its basis, it will not be inappropriate to contrast his *suspicion* of the greatness of Divine Power with the Apostle's language : "Wherefore I also cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers ; that ye may know what is the *Exceeding Greatness* of His Power towards us who believe, according to the working of His *Mighty Power*, which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead." \*

A comparison of the sentiment of this Article with the Scriptures, proves what many have long known, namely : that the product, denominated Character or holiness, contended for by a certain School of Theologians, is a very different thing from what the Inspired Apostle believed in. Of Means of Salvation, he says :

"They must be Agencies that help religious education, but not such as *mathematically* ensure success ; for a freedom from evil that is *mathematically* ensured on the part of God, so that we can cipher it out by laws of multiplication, is no addition to the world of character. It is God that conquers them [what?] entirely, in a round-about way, and not we by the aid of God."

\* Eph. 1 : 15, 19, 20.

First to the "*mathematical*" Insurance! We have been accustomed to mathematics which recognized both *quantity* and *certainty* in all processes and results; and these Laws of Mathematics are Scripturally applied to both Character and Salvation. Jesus Christ applied the Laws of Quantity and Certainty, in the declaration, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, *will draw all men* unto me." The Apostle applied them, declaring of God, "Who *will have all men* to be saved." What does the writer mean? unless indeed, he himself applies mathematics, by saying as above, relating to "mathematically ensured" success, that it "is no addition to the World of Character;" implying that the "success" *not* to be "ciphered out by laws of multiplication," which he contends for, would be an "*addition* to the world of character." Is this "*addition*" of his a *mathematical* one, often connected with "multiplication," whose Laws he repudiates? or has he found *another kind of "addition"?* "Success" must not be "ciphered out" by Laws of "Multiplication," although it may be by "addition;" which has usually been supposed to involve precisely the same "Laws" as relate to multiplication!

What absurdities and contradictions will men not perpetrate, when blinded in the support of a false theory! Since Mathematics apply to all Substances alike; since even Character cannot be exempted from the Laws of Addition, Subtraction, and Multiplication, it is quite immaterial to discriminate relating to the views of this writer in the

Quarterly, farther than to perceive that all Scripture and reason are at war with them, no less than are mathematics; which, as we have seen, indignantly spurn at the outrage done them! It is remarkable that the Advocates of the Free-Will theory cannot use a single truth; either to sustain their own hypothesis, or disprove its opposite, without manifesting the total antagonism with the Universe of their whole theory. Whatever they apply becomes a fatal noose, which annihilates their system.

Whether the Creator is simply an Auxiliary to Man; a mere "Help," and not the Primary Efficient Cause of Salvation, each must judge for himself. The position is assumed, that "character is the supreme object of Divine government among men;" while we had always supposed that Happiness, which is the object and design of character, was the end of all God's works. We knew that lapse of time, or duration and continuance, for a seasoning process, was necessary in the manufacture of wines, etc., but did not know that the same Law applied to salvation.

Of all the Principles, Causes, or Instrumentalities operating to either *promote* or *retard* Holiness in Man, what Christ metaphorically affirmed relating to casting out Satan, must be true, as follows: "How can one enter into a strong man's house and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man?" No one can fail of running into error, by adopting simply one feature of truth, and pushing it to the entire subversion of other features. But the advocates of Free-Will do worse than this; not

simply destroying the symmetry of Truth, they introduce an *element* of error, totally antagonistic to all Being and Facts.

A plain and great difference between the two systems, consists in this: Necessitarianism makes Human Salvation depend on God; upon the connection and Dependence of Cause and Effect. It subjects salvation to the Laws of Certainty, of Fore-knowledge and Prophecy, of the Divine Efficiency and Causation, relating to All Things and all Periods; to the verities of Mathematical principles, Addition, Subtraction and Multiplication, and of Times and Seasons; all which, considered either separately or together, furnish an immovable, Eternal, and sure basis of Hope. If we understand brethren of the opposite side, the substance of their language is, "Take care; don't introduce a Certainty into this subject; for that involves unavoidableness. Don't make salvation and character any thing like being 'Mathematical;' for that also involves Necessity. Neither introduce the Connection and Dependence of Cause and Effect; for the application of any such principles invades Creature Independence, not allowing Man to be any thing not proceeding, essentially and circumstantially, from God. Don't introduce too great a pressure of means; lest such a measure should involve the Connection and Dependence of cause and effect, and the fabric of character thereby be spoiled! nor dates nor seasons, for all such ideas also imply Human Dependence, and involve Certainty." If this School of Theologians allow any relation or

constituency of these principles to affect the subject, it is only in the light of a kind of dancing Diorama ; like the ever-changing scene of an Autumnal evening sky covered with the evanescent and ever-shifting drapery of the Aurora borealis ; quite too fitful to be reckoned upon.

On these two hypothesis, respectively, differing infinitely farther than the antipodes of all Creation, and as nothing in the Universe can ever adequately illustrate, it is very apparent that Man, both in this world and Eternity, must be an inconceivably different creature. On the Necessitarian hypothesis, God will be "*All*;" no less than, "*in All*;" as having conferred, and produced All that any and every creature has or is. But on our opponent's hypothesis, Man will not be Essentially different from his Maker in respect to Independence, Original Proprietorship, and Causation relating to whatever he is, or whatever he possesses, which was "self-wrought, and not a *Gift*." Relating to *part* of himself, namely: "What Man cannot do," and what is the mere "completion," like the paint or varnish,—for we know no better illustration,—for *that*, he is indebted. But whatever is "*self-wrought*," in Man, and whatever the Creator did not interfere with by "Agencies so powerful as to reduce the value of the product," that is *Man's* Creation, *his* Universe ; for which he can properly give thanks to *no* Being ! In so much, on the contingency hypothesis, the Creature is like God ; with only this material difference, that while both are

alike self-existent, Man was *Self-Caused*, while God is Eternal, and Uncaused.

Such a scheme must reduce Heaven, and Eternity to a similarity to a mixed estate, known in Law as a "hotchpot;" for a full description of which, directed by his legal neighbor, the reader can consult Blackstone. If Heaven can have but *one* Proprietor; if the Homage, and Service paid to God by Man, as well as by all the Principalities and Powers, Thrones and Dominions of Heaven, must be any thing superior to the fealty paid by a Vassal liege to his lord in feudalism, the creature can have nothing that he did not receive as a "gift;" nothing "self-wrought;" and the Creator must do more than "complete" salvation,—must do *all*. We think every discriminating mind must perceive that, if any thing ever exists in Man which is not to be traced to God, as an effect to a Primary Efficient Cause, the consequences above stated must follow; startling and novel as they appear.

Whatever strengthens the Necessitarian View, equally tends to support the conclusion that all Moral Being will be rendered ultimately Happy; and whatever impairs it, also equally militates against the doctrine that any will ever be saved who are not now in Heaven, or that those already there will remain happy; since on such a hypothesis, nothing future can be certain.

One of the most pernicious tendencies of the Free-Will theory is seen in the conviction of un-

certainty it produces in many cultivated minds, relating to the Future of Man. Defying all Divine or Human calculation, it stunts and blights Christian Hope, relating to a Brighter Life beyond the Tomb. None need be surprised at the sentiment of Uncertainty regarding the Future, prevailing so widely in the Unitarian denomination. Coming from the heart of a Trinitarian communion whom, on various accounts, they strongly disfellowshipped, they swung off into an extreme of opposition to what was true in Calvinism. Holding the vulgar Free-Willism of the day, no man can consistently believe in a Certain Happy Future, nor in undeviating Moral Rectitude, even in Heaven; because Arminianism is an antipode to whatever serves for a basis to Certainty relating to Human Character, either in this world, or Eternity. If Necessity be inconsistent with virtue *here*, can it be any less inconsistent with the higher degrees of Holiness in a Future State? Once remove Necessity, and all Certainty departs with it. On such a hypothesis who that reflects can wonder at the fact, that those who cherish loose Notions of Moral Agency believe in a state of Punishment in the Future World; which according to the theory, must be for all, since all die in a state of more or less moral disorder. The Purgatory of Romanism finds support in Free-Willism, and Heaven can never dispense with it until Moral Beings shall have become so far matured as to arrive at a state of Unavoidable Holiness; which our opponents seem to regard as a disgrace to Moral Nature. The Advocates of

Future Discipline,—another name for Punishment,—would stand at the bed-side of the Dying Saint, whom all must regard as imperfect, and poison the very atmosphere, and darken vision, by preaching a denial of Divine Efficiency to immediately introduce the soul into Heaven! Can Infidelity do much worse? Once convince us that God cannot consistently save at once, and we must doubt that He can *certainly* do any thing, or that there is any Certain Good for Man. When our opponents bring such weighty objections as these against Necessitarianism, we promise to renounce it. All the musty records of antiquated interpretations of doubtful passages in opposition to the plain volume of Holy Writ, to be found in the alcoves of Old Harvard, are appealed to in vain in such a cause!

## CHAPTER IX.

## DIFFICULTIES RELATING TO THE ORIGIN OF SIN.

THE perplexity of the question of the origin of sin has arisen through a misconception of what sin is; as if it were something in discordance with God; something resulting from mistake or redundancy in creation; or were unnecessary, and hence an evil,—the difficulty being in conceiving how evil could spring from God, or how any existence which once was unmixed good, could change itself and become evil, and so evil spring from goodness; contrary to the universal law of causation and dependence, involving that effects must correspond to their causes. Sin is an instrumentality which God uses to promote His purposes. Thus viewed it is necessary and useful, and one of the “all things” which the Apostle says work together for good. As the vanity to which for wise reasons God subjected man, sin is not an absolute imperfection or evil; the imperfection and evil in it being only relative. There can be nothing absolutely inconsistent throughout the universe, which in all its parts is to grow up into maturity; sin ultimately ceasing with misery, as being only an incipient instrumentality.

No such thing as a self-caused change of nature, by a moral being becoming evil from a state of en-

tire goodness can occur. The impossibility of a self-caused change of itself by any being as contrary to nature, is not at all inconsistent with the admitted fact that, either the stronger attributes or propensities control action, or that the greater excitement of any faculty will add to its influence, and thus modify conduct and character. All development at all times is precisely in the direction to which the tendency of nature as a whole, and as excited by circumstances, points; and cannot be possibly otherwise, without involving all the gross absurdities of the system we oppose; call it contingency, Free-Will, Arminianism, or by any other name.

Character is an effect of a combination of causes, as essential in its nature as any effect whatever, and always exactly corresponding with its causes. The fact that a change of circumstances will ever vary character to the same degree with the proportion of that change in the compound of all the causes producing character, no more vitiates its essence, than is true of all effects in the universe which, in their turn become causes; since no created being or thing exists, which would not have been otherwise than what it is, had any features of any one of its causes been different from what they were. What seems to be a small matter is often proved very material or important in the result; and that moral being who is sinful under the trials of earth, by Divine will doubtless would have been holy in circumstances adapted to control nature in the development of only love. What are

denominated circumstances are essential causes, either negative or positive, and to their extent as important as any causes. But whatever causes enter into the production of an effect, it can possess only the features of those causes; as a child can receive from its parents only their nature. These views, so obvious in themselves, are sustained by the doctrine of the whole section of the Christian Church self-styled Evangelical; which holds that nothing acceptable to God can exist in Man prior to Regeneration; because, say they, man is totally depraved, and having no moral uprightness in him, but being wholly in obliquity, all his actions, which must correspond to himself, cannot but be sinful until the tree is first made good. Once granting that man is totally depraved, in the sense of incapacity under any circumstances to produce goodness, as they hold depravity, and it is unnecessary to say that this conclusion is correct. We know of no depravity in the universe superior to all circumstances. Having adopted so correct a principle, the section of the church referred to has only to be consistent in applying it to all creation, and duration, to be shut up to the glorious conclusion, that absolute evil does not exist, and never can.

Moral disorder is only want of harmony with the principle of moral rectitude, and not discord relating to the Divine purposes, which are the universal law which is always obeyed. Men may call this confusion, contradiction, &c.; but call it what they will, Paul said, "I see another law in my

members, warring against the Law of my mind and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." There is a Law of Sin, if Paul knew any thing of the matter, no less than the Law of Love, and God is the author of both; both having their uses and answering good ends, the latter finally having the control, as the former does at first. Nature is full of such cases, the Law of Organization operating at one moment, and that of Destruction the next.

Thus a drop of water quietly reposes upon the bosom of a placid lake, held in its place by the law of gravitation. Suddenly at the rising of the sun it is expanded into life, and summoned from its mirror-bed to an aerial flight to meet a congress of sister drops, together seen from a distance forming a body of snow-white vapor as big as a man's hand. The same power which has raised it aloft upon its winged chariot, has also put the air in motion, by which, spreading its sails, it is hurried off hundreds or thousands of miles to colder regions; being finally converted into a denser state and falling upon the plain, either to refresh a drooping flower, and thus aid in beautifying and perfuming the Earth, or to mature a crop for the support of animal existence; thus serving the beneficent Purpose of the Creator, and truthfully illustrating the equal benefits of the two counter laws of heat and cold; which not only modify each other, but also the laws of attraction, cohesion, and gravitation.

The mistake of the Arminian consists in the supposition that only one moral Law, that of love, can

subserve the Divine Purposes. He resembles the mill-owner, who frets at the sun, because Old Sol subtracts water from his pond; never once thinking that a valuable end, equal to sawing logs or grinding corn, is promoted by the theft. It is as rational and as agreeable to the Divine Goodness, to suppose that every result of the Law of Sin in the Flesh is necessary and useful, as to conclude that every effect of cold is good, as well as of heat.

Men may ridicule such doctrine as all truth has been condemned, but realities are stubborn things, and must ultimately secure faith. Said the great Apostle, "The Flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the Flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, so that we *cannot* do the things that we would." Have not both the Spirit and the Flesh one Author, — God? And has He not made all things more or less subject to the varying influences of other things; the same thing first controlling and then being controlled, as Sin and Death first reign, and are to be reigned over and destroyed?

The foundation of all Reasoning is the connection or dependence between Cause and Effect, upon which we can never reasonably connect Absolute Evil with Good, as its Cause. Hence such Evil does not exist, because no Evil Eternally existed from which it could proceed, and it could no more proceed from a good Man or Angel, than from a good God. The supposition that absolute evil exists is a mistake; what we call Evil we repeat, being so only relatively, while as related to the

Whole of Individual Being, and of the Universe, All is Good. If we believe that Absolute Evil exists, we must believe with the Manicheans, that two Eternal Principles always existed; since the supposition that Evil could ever proceed from Good is the greatest absurdity imaginable. If Goodness in Man or God can produce Evil, wherein is it better than Evil or different from it? and how then can Christ's words, "A good tree *cannot* bring forth evil fruit," be true? Or will any one affirm that Evil came from Nothing? If God is the Cause of all things, or the Cause of Volition in Man by the Law of Motives, and Absolute Evil consists in Motives, He must be the Author of Absolute Evil. The attaching Eternal Punishment to Sin, and thus making it an absolute evil, although those who regard it as such make it a serviceable thing, has caused much embarrassment to the subject.

By saying that a Plan which did not exclude Sin was greatly preferable to a plan which did exclude it, Dr. Pond made sin both necessary and useful. Such being the Nature and Utility of Sin, can any one tell us why Man should be punished on its account, any farther than simply to effect its removal when it shall no longer be necessary?

While recognizing the fact that Moral Disorder is put away by Punishment, the other fact that punishment is not the only means Divinely used for a Cure, should not be overlooked. Various instrumentalities may be effectual to the promotion of this end; such as enlarged and powerful exhibitions of the Divine Goodness, and Divine influence

in rendering the threatenings and promises, and the doctrines and precepts effectual to the work of Sanctification. It may be at least asked, whether less punishment may not be used in some cases of equal moral disorder, and more of other means; and *vice versa*. The Infinite One is not confined to any one method, and for aught we see to the contrary, may vary means in different cases; although Sin always involves both an immediate loss of what virtue would have produced, and the sting inseparable from it. If the use of other means promotive of Moral Health as may be supposed, would render less punishment necessary, no object for the full measure of punishment otherwise beneficial would seem to exist; and to inflict Punishment, and thus multiply suffering without any necessity, would be odious and unworthy of the Parent, Human or Divine. This is saying only what has long been believed, namely: that Punishment must continue until Repentance, and correspond to the extent of the disease; whereas, if other means are added which induce earlier reformation, the term and amount of punishment must thereby be correspondingly lessened.

It may be said that if Sin does instrumentally effect Good, the sinner did not aim at that good, and hence that he is not any more deserving than he would be if it promoted no good. To not aim at the good is essential to Sin. Since Sin was necessary, this selfish aim was necessary also. For the good of the Universe God chose a Plan which included Sin with its oblique aim. Hence to those

who suffer by it, as well as commit it, since God is the Cause of all through them by producing their Sinful Volition, the Universe is as much in debt as if their volition had no part in it, or as if they were merely Physical and not Moral influences men were subjected to; which leaves not a vestige of ground for other Punishment than as a Cure, to bring Man into a condition in which he may share in the good for which he has suffered. This view is as pertinent to Edwards as to Dr. Pond, since he says:

“God does not will Sin as sin, or for the sake of “any thing Evil, though it is His Pleasure so to “order things that, He permitting, Sin will come to “pass, for the sake of the Good that by His disposal shall be the consequence.”\*

We might well smile at the term, “permitting,” so often used,—as if Sin, when God let it do so, produced itself; or as if a good Man or Angel, God “permitting,” could any more produce it, than a good God! But Edwards has a Divine “Pleasure to so order things that Sin will come to pass,” which is something more than a mere negative permission, and unless the words are senseless, means that God causes Sin. It should be remembered that “permission” is only a *negative* quality; never being the cause of any thing, but implying simply the not hindering an event. For the existence of Sin, a Positive, Real and Essential Cause must have existed. Since God must be the Cause

\* Edwards on the Will, Part IV. Sect. ix. p. 371, 3d. ed.

of all things, whether He produced it through the instrumentality of second causes, such as the Law of Motives, or immediately, He is the Cause of Sin. It is truly wonderful how men have shuffled about, and dodged on this subject; evidently held as thousands are, fast in the folds of error and prejudice, not daring to think on the subject; or if they thought freely, fearing to speak out! These gloves must be taken off. Although it be a profound subject, and we should ever proceed reverently, we must still remember, that the theological student like the student of Nature, must "put every thing into the fire, and see what comes out." Had the natural philosopher been as much trammelled in his investigations as the student of theology, who talks about "God's permitting things," has been, where now were the natural sciences?

Doctrinal prepossessions and prejudices like currents at sea, operate to drive the mind from truth, even though the divine chart is immediately under its eye. Most people have hesitated to say that God is the author of sin, although He has declared it to them, and reiterated it. "I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create EVIL; I the Lord, do ALL these things." "Shall there be EVIL in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?" It is unnecessary to say that this last passage is the strongest mode of affirmation, and never admits of a negative sense. God hardened Pharaoh's heart. A hard heart is an evil heart; a sinful heart. Could He harden the King's heart, and not be the author

of it? Since He is the primary efficient cause of it, God is the author of sin in a higher sense than Man is; as much so as a primary efficient author is above a secondary, instrumental one. "Author, "1. One who produces, creates, or brings into being. 2. The beginner, former, or first mover of any thing; hence the efficient cause of a thing." "To occasion, to effect."—*Noah Webster*. Quibbling is infinitely beneath the subject. We mean that God produces or causes sin; and this the Bible asserts.

It has been said that God cannot be the Author of Sin, because Man puts forth his own sinful Volition. God is neither the immediate nor the mediate cause; but the Primary Efficient Cause of Sin. The man who takes hold of a chain of a thousand separate links and draws it along, is not the immediate cause of the motion of any part of the chain except that section which he holds; but although hundreds of causes, each composed of a link, lie between him and the remote part, yet is he the cause of the movement of the whole chain. Every intermediate link in any Chain of Causes and Effects is an instrumental cause; but the Being who created all Nature, and by Creation provided for, purposed, and produced All that will result, was the only Primary Cause of whatever exists.

Rev. Hosea Ballou, one of the most consistent Bible-Adherents and powerful Intellects of the Age says: "Our argument contends that God is "the innocent Cause of the Sin which men commit, and maintains this hypothesis on the ground

“that He designs all this sin, and its consequent  
“guilt, condemnation and suffering, for the ultimate Good of all.”

Of opposition to this view he says: “There must  
“surely be something besides the dictates of Enlightened Reason, and the aspirations of a Benevolent Heart, which would raise objections to the  
“doctrine which teaches that God Pre-determined  
“all Events and overrules them all for the ultimate  
“Good of all His creatures.” \*

There could be nothing analogous to a Fall from a state of Moral Perfection to a state of Depravity, as held by many. The account of our first Parents partaking of the forbidden fruit is probably a Fable, like the Scripture account of a conversation among the vegetable Creation, illustrating the introduction of transgression. If human conduct at the present time be certain proof of moral disorder, then must the disobedience of our first Parents have proved that they were morally disordered previous to partaking of the forbidden fruit. Neander, a writer in high repute with the believers in Man's Fall, says:

“The Parable distinguishes itself from the Fable, in the fact, that in the latter, the characters and actions of beings of a higher class are attributed to those of a lower class, as for instance, human qualities to animals; while in the Parable, on the contrary, the two spheres of life, of which the lower serves to illustrate the higher, are always

\* Ballou's Sermons, pp. 308, 313.

"preserved distinct from each other,"\* What is called an account of the Fall imputes to the Serpent human speech, which is the quality of "a human being given to an animal," — precisely Neander's description of a fable.

\* Neander on the Parables of Christ.

## CHAPTER X.

## IMPORT OF EDWARDS' SYSTEM, AND THE ESTIMATION IN WHICH IT IS HELD.

RATHER than adopt an unfamiliar truth, which traverses and breaks up long standing and loved associations, it is not unusual for the mind to relieve itself of the subject by jumping at the conclusion that, though the argument seems logical, and the considerations are weighty, there probably is some false link in the chain, which invalidates the whole argument. While we have presented the language of Edwards and the statement of his system by those who defend as well as understand it, and have plainly stated what are its unavoidable results, such as all minds were they not prejudiced and warped by creeds would instantly admit, it affords us pleasure to be able to show that men of greater pretensions agree with us here. While this authority will sustain the correctness of our system, which we build upon the theory of Edwards, the continued adherence to his system by a large part of the Christian World, notwithstanding gigantic efforts of strong and accomplished minds to refute it, manifests that we have not at all misrepresented the doctrines of at least the Baptist and Orthodox Communions. Henry B. Tappan, an accomplished

Professor in one of the Colleges of New York, an Evangelical Christian, so called, and well qualified to do all that could be done in such a work, having long seen the results to which Edwards' system unavoidably led, determined if possible to break the iron logic, and the immutable laws of that system. Applying himself to the magnificent work, he wrote three large volumes against Edwards. But alas! Though the Professor was recognized and hailed a giant, and though his soul had long been in travail with the task of delivering something which should snap asunder the chain which Edwards had shown as irrevocably binding Man to his God, the pillars which he took hold of, and against which he thrust all his weight, were as immovable as the Divine throne, — and genius, and scholarship, and industry, when brought against them, were not so much as the foam that breaks and chafes at the base of Gibraltar! But says the reader, "That is only your opinion." We shall see. But first we present Professor Tappan's testimony upon the simple point of his agreement with us relating to what Edwards' system involves; for a clear perception of which he is certainly competent, and hence the high value of his authority. Though brief, the language is pertinent and full, as follows:

"The system itself is a system of Fatalism, — here then I charge directly this consequence or feature upon the System."

By "Fatalism" he means the necessity and unavoidableness of all conduct and character. Again he says:

“It is only by admitting the idea of Contingent Causality, that the dogma which affirms God to be the author of Sin, can be set aside.”

This we fully believe; and since we cannot admit the absurdity of “Contingent Causality,” which is no causality at all, we believe that God is the Efficient Primary Author of Sin. We agree with Professor Tappan relating to what inevitably results from Edwards’ System, but do not agree with him in opinion that Edwards is unsound. On this point we agree with the Orthodox and Baptist denominations, as expressed by Dr. Pond, and the Baptist Review. The latter notices Professor Tappan’s Work, as follows:

“And is it possible that Edwards is refuted at last? Has all Europe been dazzled by the brilliance of a luminary, which is now set, to rise and shine no more? Can it be that Edwards, after receiving the thanks of the most distinguished professors of foreign universities, for the light which he cast upon a most difficult subject, should himself, at last, prove but the patron of infidelity? Can it be true, that those profound reasonings are now completely demolished, by which he gained for himself, though unsought, the highest honors of philosophy, and the admiration of the most gifted minds of his age?” “We confess that our confidence in the doctrines of Edwards remains unshaken,—not because they are *his* doctrines, but because we think they are sustained by the consciousness of human nature.” “It would be strange, indeed, that the proudest

"monument he has left to the world of his intellectual greatness, should contain a *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole Christian religion." \*

That the reader may see that the sentiments of the Baptist denomination have not changed since the specimens of them presented in the Second Chapter of this work were written; that it may be seen also that their views of Election entirely agree with Dr. Emmons', as recorded in the same Chapter, we furnish the following from a popular work published by a Minister of the denomination.

"In those Scriptures which speak of the recovery of lost men, there are numerous passages which denote the existence of a covenant between the Father and the Son. . . . 1. A certain part of the Human Race are given to Christ as his Peculiar People. . . . 2. We learn from numerous passages that this grant was made to the Son before the Foundation of the World. . . . 3. Power over all flesh was also given to the Son that he might give Eternal Life to all those included in the grant of the Father. . . . Election stands intimately connected with the Covenant of Redemption. If God the Father, before the Foundation of the World, promised to the Son a part of the Human Race as his Peculiar People: If the Son engaged to die for them and bring them to Glory, then Particular Election is certain. . . . If He purposed to save any, He knew whom He would save; for known unto the Lord are all his works.

\* Christian Review, 1843, pp. 221, 222, 224.

" . . . . If men are not lost, there would be no need  
 " of salvation, and no room for Election. If they  
 " were not so lost as to render salvation by their  
 " own efforts impossible, there would be no occa-  
 " sion for Divine interposition or Election. But  
 " since they are lost beyond all hope of recovery by  
 " themselves and all created power, and if saved at  
 " all must be saved by God, they must be saved  
 " according to the purpose of God; for He un-  
 " doubtedly purposes all His acts. If he has not  
 " Purposed to save any, then none will be saved.  
 " If He has purposed to save all, then all will be  
 " saved. If He has Purposed to save only a part,  
 " then a part only will be saved. . . . , Who is the  
 " Author of this change? [Regeneration.] God is  
 " declared to be the Author." \*

He must be indeed dull who does not perceive that these extracts fully teach, that the Eternal Destiny of all men, whether in Heaven or Hell, depends not at all upon themselves, excepting only as they are subjected to necessitating causes. 1. All are "so lost as to render salvation by themselves impossible." 2. By a "Covenant," and "Gift" to the Son, "before the Foundation of the World," the Purpose of God in Election *secures* the salvation of the "part" who will be saved, in such a manner as that, if all were included in that Divine Purpose, we are plainly told, "All would be saved." Hence those who will be lost are thus destined, by coming into the World in such a condition, and

\* Elements of Theology, by Hascall, 1849, pp. 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 160, 161.

because their Maker did not include them in the Eternal Purpose of Election which included others, and not Primarily on account of their sins; although their wickedness may be the *instrumental* Cause. Let the reader judge which view,—the Baptist, or that advocated in this volume,—is most agreeable to Infinite Love, and Wisdom, and Power; not forgetting that the Orthodox view is the same. This view of Election is held by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, as contained in their VII. Article; and Article IX. clearly expresses the doctrine of Moral Necessity, it being the same as Mr. Wesley's VIII. Article, inserted in our II. Chapter.

To other quotations which we have presented showing the entire confidence reposed in Edwards by Dr. Pond, in which he makes the positions of this author his own, we need add but another brief extract. He says, "He was enabled in a period "not exceeding four months and a half, to put forth "a work the influence of which will be felt through "many generations, and which has raised its author to a distinguished rank among the Divines "and Philosophers of the World. It is well remarked by his biographer, that 'perhaps no similar "example of power and rapidity united, is to be "found in the annals of mental effort.' " \*

\* Lit. & Theo. Review, 1834, p. 525.

## CHAPTER XI.

## OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

WE have endeavored to ascertain objections from any source, and gladly notice an article from the pen of T. J. Sawyer, D.D., in the Trumpet of January 7th, 1854.

The statement that "God cannot at once *will* the existence of sin, and still forbid it," plainly contradicts the Scriptures which assert, that God hardened Pharaoh's heart, that he should not let the people go, at the same time that He commanded him to let them go; that He moved David to number the people, at the same time that He commanded him to not number them; that he sent Sennacherib, and gave him a charge, and made the "staff" in that King's hand "His indignation," when this whole course of conduct was sinful, for which this Divine instrument was condemned and punished; and that He sent a spirit to be a *lying* spirit in the mouth of prophets to persuade Ahab to go up and be slain in battle.

It is admitted by this writer, "If every event is *certain*, then no man could be *different* from what he is; or act otherwise than he does." This is precisely our ground. The question then is, whether every event is "*certain*." We think it must be,

because from Eternity it is divinely fore-known. The Doctor must admit that all that is fore-known is certain in all its features, relations, and circumstances; as fore-known. If he deny the certainty of all events, he must also deny the Divine fore-knowledge of them. What then becomes of prophecy, which fore-tells accountable human conduct? Was not what was *fore-told* certain to occur? If *certainty*, as he and we believe, proves that, in his own words, "no man could be *different* from what he is, or act otherwise than he does," must not the conduct which was fore-told, and hence fore-known and certain, have been unavoidable? But the Bible represents this fore-known and fore-told conduct as responsible, and that God regarded it as sinful, and punished moral agents for it; thus treating it as *moral*, although the Doctor intimates that conduct that cannot be different, cannot be moral or sinful. Whom shall we believe, — God, — or the Doctor? If this fore-told conduct, so certain and unavoidable, can be, and is moral, and responsible, then all human conduct, although unavoidable, may be moral, and responsible also.

But on this hypothesis, says this writer, "There is no more *drunkenness, lying, fraud, adultery, or murder* in the world, than God from Eternity wished, and arranged for!" Of passion, instrumental in murder, David declared, "The *wrath* of Man shall praise Thee, and the remainder Thou wilt restrain." Since He restrains what will not praise Him, and does not restrain what will praise Him, it is quite natural to infer that His will is ex-

ecuted by, both the existence of human wrath, and its restraint. Relating to "lying," since God commanded a spirit to go and "be a lying spirit in the mouth of prophets,"\* it is undeniably His will that there shall be lying in the world. Relating to the "adultery" in the earth, the Apostle Peter speaks of some, "Having eyes full of adultery, that *cannot* cease from sin." Relating to rapine, and slaughter, which are worse than fraud, it certainly was the Will of God that the King of Assyria should commit these crimes against the Jews; although He punished him for it, as taught in Isaiah 10. If it was obviously the Divine Will that some sin should exist, is it not as rational to suppose that all sin is according to the Divine Will, as that any is? The coming of Christ to put away sin, is no more inconsistent with the truth that God had a wise and holy purpose in causing it, than is the putting away of any thing by appropriate means, after that thing or instrumentality has served its purpose.

"Wherein then, does *sin* differ from *holiness*," if "God *chose* it, *willed* it, *ordained* it," and "He was *wise* in so doing, and did it for a good purpose?" Said Joseph to his brethren, "You meant it for evil, but God meant it for good." The holy Patriarch understood the plain and only difference between the sinful purpose of his brethren, and the Holy Purpose of God. Both these purposes related to the same event, so that the difference, in his view, did not consist in man's meaning *one* thing

\* See 1 Kings, 22.

or event, and God a *different* one, as the Doctor contends; for both God and Man meant the same event, here expressed by the word "*it*." But there was a difference, and the only difference is fully explained by this "old philosopher," in the words, "You meant it for evil, but God meant it for good." He who "works all things after the counsel of His own will" means *all* for good, which man means for evil. Such is the plain difference the *Bible* makes, between sin and holiness, while the Doctor makes an *anti-Bible* difference.

To the following from the pen of the Doctor, we ask attention :

"In Jesus Christ, in whom we behold the treasures of the Divine Power and grace, we recognize the *moral* influences that are yet to subject all things to Himself." Such is the Doctor's faith in the salvation of all mankind. After re-perusing it, and marking well its import, let the reader look at the following, from the same pen : "If every event *is certain*, then no man could be *different* from what he is, or act otherwise than he does. . . . He to whom it is possible to act in only one way as philosophical necessity plainly teaches, is no more a moral being, nor responsible for his action than is a stone. . . . God might have made Man what your philosophy represents him to be, a creature governed by necessity, and therefore destitute of morality." With these two classes of statements under our eye, the grave question is, does the Doctor mean a "*certainty*," by his affirmation that the "Divine Power and grace are yet to

subject all things to Himself?" It is obvious that he does; and then on his own premises, it undeniably follows that the "subjected" creature of his Universalism is to be "no more a moral being, nor responsible for his action than is a stone!"

"The *moral* influences which are yet to SUBJECT all things," in any ordinary, or allowable sense of the terms, are *necessitating* means; and if they be certain to save all men, as he affirms, admit no possibility of perpetual resistance of them by the Creature who is to be "subjected;" unless indeed it be possible for man to remain unsaved, at the very time at which he is saved. He has *italicised* the word "*moral*," as it stands connected with "means." Does he thereby intend, that "Moral Means" cannot Necessitate conduct? Our opposers have often endeavored to mislead minds into the belief that Necessitarians hold to a *Physical* Necessity of *Moral* conduct, while nothing is farther from the truth.

In every sense, as defined by learned Lexicographers, Necessitarians reject the idea, that accountable conduct and volition are necessitated by any other means than such as are moral. By moral, we suppose the Doctor intends whatever operates as Motives, and relates to the Conscience, Understanding, and Affections; and such "*moral* means" he affirms will "subject," — the same as morally necessitate, — "all things to Christ." He, then, is a Necessitarian, as well as others. He applies Necessity to the *Eternal* well-being, conduct, and character of Man, if not to human conduct and

character in this world. It remains for him to show how the doctrine of moral necessity is such a "slime-pit," — the euphonious name he gives it, — relating to this world, while in his view, as above, it is allowable in its application to the enlarged sphere and capacities of Heaven! — how it can be consistent with the exalted virtue or holiness of the glorified soul, when he holds it to be so very inconsistent with the least degree of moral character and accountability here!

The sentiment that "God has made Man able to obey," in any instance in which he does not, instead of being "always implied in the Bible," as the Doctor asserts, is plainly contradicted, again and again by the Inspired Writers; as the reader will see by consulting p. 60 of this work. The idea that Man can do different from what he does in any case, is only a *human inference*, which never weighs enough in candid minds to overbalance the Divine Testimony, any more than do the conclusions "of all human governments, all history, all moral judgments, and universal human consciousness," which, — or at least what has been so-called, — has often been proved in error.

A correct exegesis of the passage, "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God, for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man," &c., will show nothing contrary to other plain Scriptures. Applying the Doctor's idea to the term "tempteth," as meaning that the Divine Agency is never employed in causing Man to sin, the reader can easily contrast the Apostle

James with the Divine Oracle in Judges, 9 : 23, as follows : " Then God sent an evil spirit between Abimelech and the men of Shechem : and the men of Shechem dealt treacherously with Abimelech ; " which is only one passage of many, which teach the same kind of Divine Agency in sin. Treachery is sin, and God was its Author, by sending an evil spirit ; which agrees with numerous declarations relating to the Divine government. One canon of interpretation teaches that plain Historical Scripture is never to be set aside by a mere word, found in a passage of difficult meaning. The word " tempteth," in this passage can easily allow a meaning consistent with the doctrine of the Universal Divine Efficiency as we have explained it ; while construing it into a denial that God uses means to promote sin, would be the greatest possible violence done to numerous Scriptures, — no less than blotting them from the record.

Of the possibility of the Creator's preventing sin in Man, he says : " He might have made him as he is, but so guarded him, and interposed in his behalf, whenever exposed to sin, as to ward off the danger and save him from its commission." Here is obviously another contradiction of himself by the Doctor. If "*as he is*," means "*a moral being*," — for which he strenuously contends, — and our Maker could have "so guarded man, and interposed in his behalf, whenever exposed to sin, as to ward off the danger, and save him from its commission," what indeed would such a procedure have involved, but the *Necessitating* of Man to not sin ?

—the establishing of a "*certainty*," of which he tells us, "if every event is *certain*, then no man "could *be different* from what he is, or act otherwise than he does." When the Doctor can explain to us how God could have done what he describes, and so saved man from sin, without involving a "*certainty*," which he admits reveals a necessity, he may vindicate his consistency, which in this instance admits of no other vindication; since he tells us only a dozen lines above this last quotation that, "to be a creature governed by necessity," involves being "therefore destitute of morality."

If there were no good reasons on account of which sin should exist, and for which God should will and cause it; and if, as the Doctor here states, God could have prevented it, although He made Man "as he is," can any reason be assigned why He did not prevent it? A little further on he tells us that, "It is better that man should be a *moral* being, even though he sometimes sins, than that he should be deprived of morality, and incapable of attaining moral happiness;" and this is urged as the reason why God did not prevent Sin; notwithstanding he had only a breath before said that, although He had made man as he is, God might have so "guarded, interposed, and warded off danger, as to save him from its commission."

We have still another question: If there were no good reasons on account of which Sin should be Divinely caused, and God is to save Man from sin by Christ, as is affirmed by him, why did not

God prevent sin at first, by means not a whit more Certain and Necessitating than any final and Eternal salvation by Christ must be; especially since prevention is always easier than cure?

In another article, Dr. S. says: "We all *feel* "that we act freely, and might do otherwise than "we do." While he claims the testimony of "Universal Consciousness" in support of his theory of "Liberty to either side," and while his consciousness teaches him that Edwards' System of Necessitarianism is a "slime-pit — utterly false and mischievous," the Christian Review says: "We confess that our confidence in the Doctrines of Edwards remains unshaken, not because they are his doctrines, but because we think they are sustained by the consciousness of Human Nature." Dr. Ballou's consciousness also, is not included in Dr. Sawyer's "*universal* consciousness;" since he says: "There is my good neighbor over the way, "I am conscious that I can injure him *if I will*;" "and I am equally conscious that I cannot, now, "*will* to injure him, nor even try heartily to form "such a will. I have the capacity to hate him, *were* "*I so disposed*;" but just now, I neither am, nor can "be so disposed." We are not aware that Edwards himself ever taught any Moral Necessity plainer, or more absolute than this. We give all these three authors credit for honesty and ability, while we certainly cannot believe them *all*; but think rather, that one of them at least, has mistaken something else for consciousness; this diversity intimating how difficult it sometimes is to be cer-

tain what consciousness is, and that consciousness may be only a *false* impression.

Since Dr. S. says: "He to whom it is possible to act in only one way, as philosophical necessity plainly teaches, is no more a moral being, nor responsible for his action, than is a stone," if this is true, and Dr. Ballou's idea of himself was correct, the latter was "no more a moral being, nor responsible for his action, than is a stone." Since also, Dr. B. thus describes his common or ordinary state, agreeably to his own testimony relating to himself, according to Dr. Sawyer's doctrine he is not, never was, and never will be, "moral or responsible, any more than a stone!" But Dr. Ballou at the time of which he spoke was controlled by motives; was an intelligent spirit; endowed with will and the moral sense, which was the very element in his nature, owing to which he "could not will to injure his neighbor;" in all which respects he totally differed from a stone, and hence was "moral and responsible for his action," while a stone is not, — Dr. S. to the contrary, notwithstanding.

Do any, at the same time that Jehovah is saying to Man, "O Ephraim; how can I give thee up? O Judah, how can I give thee up?" "O do not that abominable thing which I hate;" "Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?" disbelieve that it can be consistent or possible for Him to work in creatures that very conduct which He seems thus to deplore? In what respects is it any more consistent or possible for God to so create brutes that the larger fish devour the smaller ones;

that the male crocodile eats its young; and the vulture preys upon the dove? Although He purposely made animals so that they would do all this, His tender Heart as *sincerely* sympathizes with them as relating to the pains and penalties endured by sinners; or as His Understanding dictated what was best in such a mode of inferior existence. Why may not God as sincerely lament over the very depravity and pains Himself for the best of reasons causes in His Moral Offspring, as a father can weep and yearn over the wound caused by himself in the amputation of a diseased limb? It is the *nature* of the Divine Heart to sympathize and commiserate all pain, no less than to prefer whatever is best; and we see no lack of Moral harmony in this. God loves moral rectitude; and He equally, or more, loves what he sees will be for the best; according to the importance of each. He approves of moral disorder in offspring, on account of the good it will secure; but as viewed in the partial light of the stand-point of moral uprightness, forbids and deplors it. If this is inconsistent in God, is it not inconsistent for an earthly parent to designedly subject his child to that pain he laments; to make a wound, for the healing of which he has provided a remedy before applying the amputating knife?

The principle involved in all this, and what we contend for is, that it is no more derogatory to the Divine Character to cause Moral, than Physical Disorder; and the facts urged against the Doctrine of the Divine Efficiency relating to Sin are only

the moral phenomena consistently belonging to the case.

Says Dr. Pond, a gentleman whose office it is to prepare young men for the *Orthodox* Ministry: "Some good reasons may be assigned for the existence of sin." Grant only this sentiment, in which we concur, and it follows that sin is not unmixed, or absolute evil; and hence no such evil exists. As sinners do not act from motives drawn from the "good reasons" why sin should exist, and as such reasons involve that it will produce more good than evil, and thus prove beneficial, in agreement with the Doctor's assertion that a Plan including sin is better than one excluding it, it follows according to this Author, as we have elsewhere stated, that if God did not purpose that sin should exist, the sinner has improved upon God's Plan!

This view certainly changes the whole aspect of sin and its punishment, and opposes itself in unchangeable and overwhelming antagonism against the so-called Evangelical theory of accountability, and punishment, which fact the Doctor alludes to as follows:

"Do any say that this is changing the very nature of sin, and representing it as a *good thing*?  
"But we urge in reply, that the whole view which has been given necessarily supposes that sin is a *bad thing*—the worst of all things. Sinners would not need to be redeemed from that which was good."\*

\* Lit. & Theo. Review, 1834, pp. 434, 436.

Such is another piece of the Doctor's logic, substituted where only a much more solid material would serve, and adapted to slightly cover an inconsistency. No rational man doubts that sin is and must be a *very different* matter, if "there are good reasons for it," and if the "best plan" included it, from what it would have been, otherwise. What if sin is "a *bad thing*,—the worst of all things,"—does the Doctor mean by this that it is not *good* also? existing for "good reasons;" affording as nothing else could do, an opportunity for Redemption, which he represents as the highest glory of God; thus making it *necessary* to the best Divine Plan. What if it be "the worst of all things?"—if it was essential to the greatest perfection of the Divine Mode, as he says it is, although its perpetrators need to be redeemed from it after it shall have fully served its purpose, on the whole it must be, and is a *good thing*.

Some may say, "I am conscious that I control my conduct, and am the cause of all my actions." True; but God is the Creator of your body and soul; of your Will, Understanding, Conscience, and Sensitivity; in accordance with which you must act. As *you* control your conduct and character, *God* controls you, by making you what you are, and momentarily sustaining you. He thus controls your actions, and whole development, on the obvious hypothesis that your love and hate, your volitions and actions, strictly depend on what you are, and cannot possibly be otherwise than in correspondence with yourself. If you can, indeed,

act contrary to yourself; if neither the *kind* nor the *degree* of action is limited and fixed by nature, then you can act like God; like the most elevated angel, or man; nay, like an elephant, a rhinoceros, or a whale,—can be intellectually a Webster, a Newton, or a Bacon; and morally a Howard, a Whitfield, or Jesus Christ, as well as what you are, by only willing to be, and do so! If you are correct, and we are wrong in this matter, it is reasonable in us to expect that you will demonstrate your theory by *thus* being, and acting,—especially since such high motives prompt so elevated a course. But if you cannot be and do thus, then rationally adopt our theory.

The utter absurdity of the doctrine, that the same Cause or Being could ever put forth fruits or effects so totally opposite as Holiness and Sin, would seem to preclude its belief by a rational mind; agreeably to the metaphorical language of Scripture, “A fountain doth not send forth both salt water and fresh!”

To the general idea here presented, it may be objected, that it greatly modifies the prevalent opinion of the evil of Sin. If the doctrine be true, this result, instead of being an objection, should be received with favor. Must not he who objects to having sin prove to be any less an evil than some have made it, have a gross taste for the horrible? Because some have made transgression an Infinite Evil, must we adopt such a theory simply because it makes the most of sin, and consigns countless millions to unending and ineffable torment? If it

be a virtue to make disobedience the greatest imaginable evil, to be virtuous we might cipher the alleged infinite evil into as many infinitudes as any conceivable sum of figures might represent! We might thus also justify the nursery maid in all conceivable tortures of infant minds with ideas that bears and dragons will rend them for the least juvenile delinquency!

If Necessitarianism be not true, then absolute evil exists; and if absolute evil exists, it can easily be demonstrated that it will never cease to exist, as follows: 1. Pure, absolute evil will never eradicate itself. 2. It must require at least as much Divine Power, Wisdom, and Love, and the same *kind* of means to eradicate it, as would have been proper and adequate to have prevented it. 3. The relation of such evil to all beings and things, to all circumstances and periods, is evil, and only evil; therefore no reason can exist why it should ever be eradicated which did not in the beginning as strongly urge its prevention. 4. If such evil exists, it was not proper for God to prevent it; and if it was not proper for God to prevent it at first, then it will never be any more proper for Him to destroy it; and as it will never cease to exist of itself, it must continue forever.

On the hypothesis that absolute evil exists as the result of a moral agency not necessitated, since Free Agents would never be certainly controlled, where is the least basis for any assurance that this absolute evil will not ere long, like an Alpine avalanche or an Oriental epidemic, sweep through heav-

en, and the whole moral universe become one horrid lazaretto of moral disease and eternal death ?

It has been said that Will and Desire are sometimes in opposition to each other. When a malefactor wills to walk to the gallows rather than be dragged like a bullock, on the whole he desires to go rather than endure the alternative. The action of Will, *if* against desire, would only prove that there exists in the will a tendency, without which it could not act, and by which it is necessitated. Some have supposed that Necessitarianism is disproved by the theory that the Will has a principle of action within itself. It makes no difference in what attribute we locate the principle of agency, or whether in only one or all of the faculties, since it must be equally true, that the *nature* of the principle moving to action must decide what the action shall be. Dr. Clarke's supposition that the Creator is not controlled by His infinite nature, and hence that He could make man thus free, is contradictory to Scripture. Others have attempted to prove the doctrine of "Liberty to either side," by the hypothesis that man is an *efficient* cause. Man is not independent ; and if he were, could possess no Liberty to either side. God is the only Efficient, Independent Cause in the Universe. Although Infinite and uncaused, and hence Independent, He has no Liberty to either side but, as Dr. Beecher well says, is under an "Infinite Necessity," — the necessity which Nature is always under to itself, to develop, and act according to itself,

## CHAPTER XII.

RELIANCE DUE TO THE CONCURRENCE OF SCRIPTURE  
AND PHILOSOPHY.

SOME distrust the light of philosophy and reason; either because their minds are so constituted that they cannot perceive their guidance, or they are unaccustomed to judge in these matters, or think the illuminations of nature unsafe. Fortunately for such, the Holy Scriptures determine what is truth. Whenever Philosophy perfectly accords with the plainest declarations of the Bible, although the mind often reposes confidently upon the conclusions of reason alone, all may feel doubly assured, whenever Reason and Written Revelation unite their testimony.

The following Scriptures are in point: As showing that God causes His people to do His will,

“I will put my spirit within you, and *cause* you to walk in my statutes.” “The Lord God will *cause* righteousness and praise to spring forth before all nations.\*

God is said to *incline* the hearts of His people to obey Him. “The Lord our God be with us—that he may *incline* our hearts unto him, to walk in all his ways.” “Incline my heart unto thy tes-

\* Ezk. 36 : 27. Isa. 61 : 11.

timonies, and not to covetousness." "Incline not my heart to any evil thing." \*

God is spoken of as *turning* the hearts of men. "The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord; as the rivers of water he turneth it whithersoever he will." Other mens' hearts are as much in the hand of the Lord as those of kings. "Turn us O God of our Salvation." "Turn us again, O God of hosts." "Turn thou me, and I shall be turned, for thou art the Lord my God." †

God is said to make men obedient or perverse.

"O Lord why hast thou made us to err from thy ways, and hardened our hearts from thy fear." "The Lord make you to increase and abound in Love." "Make me to go in the path of thy commandments." "The Lord direct your hearts into the Love of God, and the patient waiting for Christ." ‡ "Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the people of Israel were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done." "The king hearkened not unto the people, for the cause was from the Lord, that he might perform his saying, which the Lord spake by Ahijah the Shilonite, and Jeroboam the son of Nebat." "For God hath put into their hearts to fulfil, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the beast." "Him being delivered by the *determinate* counsel and fore-knowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and

\* 1 Kings, 8 : 57, 58. Psalms, 119 : 36 ; 141 : 4.

† Prov. 21 : 1. Psalms, 80 : 7. Isa. 8 : 54. Jer. 31 : 18.

‡ Isa. 63 : 17. Psalms, 119 : 35. 2 Thes. 3 : 5.

slain." Joseph said to his brethren, "It was not you that sent me hither, but God."\* "I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me. I will pour out upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." "Create in me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me." "We are his workmanship, *created* unto good works." "It is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do, of his good pleasure. Who are *kept* by the power of God, through faith unto salvation. Now unto him *who is able to keep you from falling*, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory," &c. "And the Lord said unto Moses, see that thou do all these wonders before Pharaoh. But I will harden his heart, that he will not let the people go. And I will harden Pharaoh's heart, and multiply my signs and my wonders," &c.† "Go in unto Pharaoh, for I have hardened his heart, and the heart

\* Acts, 4: 27, 28. 1 Kings, 12: 15. Rev. 17: 17. Acts, 2: 23. Sam. 45: 8.

† Ezk. 36: 24, 26, 27. Jer. 32: 40. Zech. 12: 10. Psa. 110: 3. Psa. 51: 10. Eph. 2: 10. Phil. 2: 13. 1 Peter, 1: 5. Jude, 24: 25. Ex. 4: 21; 7: 3, 4; 14: 3, 4; 16: 17; 10: 1.

of his servants, that I might show these my signs before him."

If the Scriptures relating to the Purposes and Agency of God, as affecting the Hearts and Actions of men, declaring that He hardens the heart and makes it obstinate; that He *causes* righteousness to spring forth; that He is able to *keep* men from falling, till he presents them faultless before the presence of His glory; that He *inclines* the hearts of His people to obey Him; that He *works* in them to *will* and to *do*; that He *turns* them at his pleasure; that His *counsel determines* before, the things to be done by Human Agency; that He *makes* men *obedient* or *perverse*; that He *gives a new heart* and a right spirit; and that He *directs* their hearts into the love of God; connected as they are, with the most comprehensive affirmations, that He "*worketh All Things after the Counsel of His own Will*," and "Of Him, through Him, and to Him are All Things," — we repeat, if all this does not fully teach that all Human Conduct is as absolutely Controlled by the Creator, as the development of a seed was ever subjected to the Laws of Nature, it is certainly incumbent upon our opponents to set forth language in contrast with it, more clearly expressing such a doctrine. The fact that our Saviour often compared Man to the Vegetable Kingdom, manifests that, relating to Necessity of development, the similarity was perfect.







~~SEP 30 1982~~

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

TILLOTSON, Obadiah H.

**AUTHOR**

The divine efficien-

**TITLE**

cy and moral harmony of

**Call Number**

BJ

1406

.T5

